THE VISUALIZATION OF THE DEITIES
OF THE TRIKA

BY

ALEXIS SANDERSON

1. THE TRIKA

1.1. By the term Trika I intend an entity in ritual rather than theology. I refer to a cluster of Tantric Śaiva cults[1] with a common system or 'pantheon' of *mantra*-deities. The distinctive core of this pantheon *(yāgaḥ)*[2] is the three goddesses Parā, Parāparā and Aparā, and the two alphabet-deities Śabdarāśi[-bhairava] (also called Mātṛkā[bhairava]) and Mālinī.[3]

1.2.1. The best documented of these cults is that which is expounded by Abhinavagupta in his *Tantrāloka* on the basis of the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*. Also in this branch is the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata (/Siddhāmata, Siddhātantra)*, probably the earliest and most fundamental of the Trika's scriptures. This work survives, but in what is certainly a much shorter redaction than that known to the Kashmirians.[4]

N.B. My emendations of quoted passages are indicated as follows. The emendation is printed in roman type followed by the rejected syllables of the MS or edition printed in italics within parentheses.

(1) The word Tantric *(tāntrikaḥ)* is used here in its wide sense, i.e. to cover both Tantric and Kaula forms of ritual. For the narrower sense of the word, in which it is opposed to Kaula, see Sanderson 1990.

(2) For *yāgaḥ* in this sense, lit. 'that which is worshipped' *(ijyata iti yāgaḥ)*, see, e.g., Kṣemarāja on SvT 2.158b *(yāgaṃ tatraiva vinyaset)*: *ijyata iti yāgo mantragaṇaḥ*; also on SvT 13.1 and NeT 16.58ab; SvT 4.522ab *(yāgaṃ saṃhareta)*; PicM-BY f.210v3 *(yāgaṃ ...aśeṣam tatra vinyaset)*; *Kriyādīpikā* quoted at SomŚPaddh 3, p. 161 *(yāge visarjite)*; Abhinavagupta, TSāra p. 191 *(upasaṃhṛte yāge)*.

(3) Cf. KulRatnU f.79r: *śabdarāśiś ca mālinyā vidyānāṃ tritayasya ca / sāṅgopāṅgasamāyuktaṃ(ā) trikatantraṃ kariṣyati //*. The verse is ungrammatical; but the probable sense is, '[Śiva] will produce the scripture(s) of the Trika equipped with Śabdarāśi, Mālinī, and the three Vidyās [Parā, Parāparā and Aparā] together with their divisions and subdivisions.'

(4) MSS: NAK 5/2403; ASB 5465 (G).

1.2.2. Three other major forms of the Trika are accessible to us. These are those of the *Devyāyāmala,* the *Triśirobhairava,* and the *Tantrasadbhāva.* Of these āgamas only the last survives in its entirety.[5] The first and the second can be studied only through various quotations and reports in the Kashmirian literature, particularly in the *Tantrāloka* and its commentary (the *-viveka* of Jayaratha). There are also materials closely related to both the *Devyāyāmala* and the *Triśirobhairava,* but particularly to the former, in the *Jayadrathayāmala (/Tantrārāja[-bhaṭṭāraka]).*[6]

1.2.3. To these systems we must add that of the Anuttara, Ekavīra, or Parākrama. Distinguished by these names from the Trika proper it reduces the latter's *yāga* to the first of the two alphabet-deities and the goddess Parā, or else to Parā alone. Its scriptural basis, the short *Parātriṃśikā,* has come down to us with extensive exegesis, most notably with two commentaries by Abhinavagupta, the long *-vivaraṇa* and the short *[laghu-] vṛtti.*

2. PARĀ

2.0. It appears from Abhinavagupta that the main source of the Trika's deity visualizations *(dhyānāni)* was the *Siddhayo-geśvarīmata.*[7] Some relevant material appears, as we shall see, in the short redaction of this work which survives; but what we find there and in the other sources that remain does not amount to a complete description of the system's icons.

2.1.1. I have found fully detailed visualizations only in the case of Parā, the highest of the three goddesses; and these come not from any of the āgamas of the Trika or even from Kashmir, but from the post-scriptural literature of the Anuttara cult in the form in which it was practised in the Tamil-speaking region in the far south of the subcontinent. Thus the *Parātriṃśikātātparyadīpikā,* a verse commen-

tary on the *Parātriṃśikālaghuvṛtti* of Abhinavagupta, has the following invocation as its second verse:[8]

> May the Supreme Power [Parā] protect you, [she who is as brilliantly white] as a markless moon, three-eyed, adorned with the crescent moon [upon her hair], her [two] hands showing the gesture *(mudrā)* and the book.

2.1.2. That this work is south Indian is evident from the facts that its author records that it was composed "in the city of the Lord of the Hall of Consciousness" *(pure citpariṣatpateḥ),* that is to say, in the temple-city of Cidambaram;[9] that he mentions that city with Kashmir, Banaras and Kailāsa as one of four centres of the Trika;[10] and that he looks upon the Śiva Lord of Dancers (Naṭarāja) who is the deity of its temple as embodying the Trika's dynamic non-duality of consciousness.[11]

2.2. The same verse is found as the visualization text for Parā in the form of Anuttara worship (Parākrama) followed in the cult of the goddess Lalitā (/Tripurasundarī) centred on the south Indian city of Kāñcī (Kāñcīpuram).[12] In that cult, as prescribed in the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra,* Parā is worshipped as Lalitā's 'heart' *(hṛdayam).*[13]

2.3. A hymn to Parā *(Parāstutiḥ)* attributed to one Sahajānan-danātha and recited at the end of the cult in that tradition identifies the 'gesture' *(mudrā)* of the visualization verse as that of Consciousness *(cinmudrā),* and assigns it to the goddess's right hand:[14]

(5) MSS: NAK 5/445 (AD 1097); 1/363; 5/1985.

(6) This work, the largest surviving Śaiva āgama (24,000 ślokas in four ṣaṭkas), was current in Kashmir in the time of our commentators (AD 950 +) and was redacted, if not entirely composed, in that region; see my forthcoming 'The Date and Provenance of the *Jayadrathayāmalatantra.*'

(7) PTViv 278, 10-13 (265,18-266, 4): ... *siddhāditantrādividhim eva tadāśayenaiva nirūpitataddhyānādisaṃkocam ālambatām.*

(8) PTTātpD 2: *akalaṅkaśaśāṅkābhā tryakṣā candrakalāvatī / mudrāpustalasadbāhā pātu vaḥ paramā kalā //.*

(9) PTTātpD 531d. See also ibid. 535c: *saṃvitsaṃsannabhomadhye* (emending the edition's *saviśāsaṃnabhormadhye*). For the Hall of Consciousness *(citsabhā, citpariṣat, saṃvitsaṃsat)* at Cidambaram containing the space-linga *(ākāśaliṅgam)* and the idol of Śiva Lord of Dancers (Naṭarāja) see, e.g., Kulke 1970, 140 and Plate 3.

(10) PTTātpD 3: *śrīmatkailāsakaśmīrakāśivyāghrapurīsthitam / trikārthadarśinaṃ vande devam somāṃśabhūṣaṇam //.* Vyāghrapurī (< the old Tamil Puliyūr ['Place of the Tiger']) = Cidambaram; see Kulke 1970, 32.

(11) PTTātpD 532-536. At 536b I propose to emend *tvaṭanodyogaśālinaḥ* to *naṭano-dyogaśālinaḥ.*

(12) ParaśurKS *khaṇḍa* 8 (Anuttarapaddhati / Parākrama), 20; Nityots 193, 15-16; 195, 17; MahātripV 171, 6-7. These have *pātu māṃ* where PTTātpD has *pātu vaḥ.* Variants are also seen at ŚVidyārṇT 58, 31-32 (/ MahātripV 34, 1-2) in the *parāsampuṭitamātṛkānyāsaḥ (lasadbāhuṃ praṇamāmi parāṃ kalām)* and PrapañcSPKD 589, 21-22 *(muktāmaṇivibhūṣitām* for the last *pāda).*

(13) ParaśurKS 8.1: ... *siṃhāsanavidyāhṛdayam anuttaraṃ parābījarūpam ...*; Rāmeśva-ra's commentary ad loc.: ... *yā vidyā sā tripurasundarī lalitā tasyāḥ hṛdayaṃ hṛdayarūpam;* Nityots 190, 5: *parā śrīhṛdayātmikā.*

(14) Nityots 196, verse 5: *bhaktajanabhedabhañjanacinmudrākalitadakṣapāṇitalām / pūrṇāhantākāraṇapustakavaryena ruciravāmakarām //.*

Her right hand is adorned with the Consciousness-gesture which destroys duality in [the minds of] her devotees, and her left hand displays [a bound manuscript of] the Supreme Scripture which is the means of attaining the [liberated] state of all-including I-ness.

This detail is also given in a description of Parā in the *Lalitopā-khyāna*, a Purāṇic work devoted to the praise *(māhātmyam)* of the Kāñcī Lalitā cult,[15] and in the *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā*, a south Indian work of the Vaiṣṇava Pañcarātra composed in the eleventh century in a milieu strongly influenced by the Trika.[16] The gesture is formed by showing the palm at the level of the heart with the thumb and the index finger joined to form a circle.[17]

2.4. Sahajānanda's hymn also tells us that Parā is to be visualized within a lunar disc,[18] wearing a necklace of pearls, pearl earrings, and a garment of spotless white linen.[19]

2.5.1. The *Rahasyapañcadaśikā* adds the option that Parā may be visualized holding a pen *(lekhanī)* in her right hand instead of showing the gesture.[20]

2.5.2. The attribution of this work to Abhinavagupta is certainly false : it too is probably a south Indian work.[21]

(15) BrahmāP (Lalitop) 39.9-10: *ādyā yānuttarā(?. yānutarā) sā syāc citparā tu ādikāraṇam / anākhyeti(?.antākhyeti) tathā proktā svarūpa(svarūpāt)tattvacintakaiḥ // 9 // dvitīyābhūt tataḥ śuddhaparā dvibhujasaṃyutā / dakṣahaste yogamudrāṃ vāmahaste tu pustakam // 10 // bibhratī himakundendumuktāsamavapurdyutiḥ / parāparā tṛtīyā syād...*

(16) AhirbS 24.16: *pūrṇenduśītalarucir dhṛtabodhamudrā bāhvantarasthanijabodhana-pustakāḍhyā / devī parā paramapuruṣadivyaśaktiś cintyā prasannavadanā sarasīruhākṣī //.* Schrader (1916: 96-99) dated this work to some time between AD 300 and 700, and considered it to have been written in Kashmir. For proofs that it is a southern work of the eleventh century see my forthcoming 'The Date and Provenance of the *Lakṣmītantra* and the *Ahirbudh-nyasaṃhitā.*'

(17) ŚārTilPĀ 358, 21-23: *... jñānamudrā aṅguṣṭhatarjanīyogarūpā pārśvābhimukhī...*; JñānārṇT 4.40c-41b: *tarjanyaṅguṣṭhayoge tu dakṣahaste tu pārvati // 40 // akṣamāleti mudreyaṃ jñānamudrā ca vai bhavet /.*

(18) Nityots 196, verse 2: *ānandacaraṇakamalām akalaṅkaśaśāṅkamaṇḍalacchāyām / tanmaṇḍalādhirūḍhāṃ tatkalayā kalitacitkalāṃ naumi //.* Also RahPañc 24b: *candramaṇḍ-alāntaḥsthe* (voc.).

(19) Nityots 196, verse 4ab: *mauktikamaṇiganarucirāṃ śaśāṅkanirmokanirmalam kṣau-mam / nivasānāṃ parameśīṃ namāmi...*; 6cd: *mauktikatāṭaṅkābhyām maṇḍitamukhamaṇḍalām parāṃ naumi //.*

(20) RahPañc 23cd: *hastayugmadhṛtapustatūlikāṃ bālikāṃ paricinomi tāṃ parām // 32c: līlāpustakalekhinīdharakarā ciccandrabimbāsthitā.* The basic *dhyāna* is at 21: *dordvandva-saṃkalitapustakabodhamudre ...* (voc.).

(21) The *Rahasyapañcadaśikā* has been tentatively included among the works of Abhinavagupta by Pandey (1963:71, 74-75; 954-56 [text]). He notes that the attribution is doubtful because the MS he transcribes contains 37 verses while the final verse, which

2.6. In this same context, namely the visualization of Parā in the regular *(niyatakālam [nityam])* and compulsory *(niyatakaraṇīyam [nityam])* form of the cult, the short *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Mālinīvijayottara* do not provide the details needed for a complete *dhyāna*. They tell us only that the goddess is as white as the moon or crystal and that she nourishes the universe by pouring forth the nectar of life.[22] However the first of these sources is more forth-coming when it teaches the visualization of Parā in the yogic meditations which may be practised by *sādhaka*s for specific, nontranscendental goals. Two such meditations are found in the text : (i) for the defeat of death *(mṛtyuñjayasādhanam)*, and (ii) for the mastery of the poet's art and the attainment of all knowledge *(kavitvasādhanam, sarvajñatvasādhanam)*.[23]

In the first the *sādhaka* visualizes a white, eight-petaled lotus above his head, with the moon's disc as its centre. He then visualizes Parā in the centre of this disc pouring forth nectar which enters through the aperture in his cranium (the *brahmarandhram*) and fills his body. As for the details of her form, we are told only that she is white.[24] In the second Parā is to be contemplated in much the same manner. She is described as seated within a lotus above the *sādhaka* pouring forth nectar; but now it is the nectar of omnis-

contains the attribution, refers to a text of only 15 verses (37cd: *ime 'bhinavaguptena ślokāḥ pañcadaśoditāḥ*). But there are other reasons for rejecting the attribution. Verse 34 contains the non-Abhinavaguptan but Advaitavedāntist terminology of *sat, cid,* and *ānanda* (35a: *sadaṃśam cidaṃśe cidaṃśaṃ mudaṃśe*) and the distribution of the letters of the alphabet on (/as) the body of Sarasvatī in verse 1 is not that of Abhinavagupta's Trika (see TĀ 15. 117c - 120c), but that of the south Indian *smārta* tradition of the *Prapañcasāra* (see PrapañcS 7.3; Nityots 94, 1-15).

(22) SiYogM 6.27c-28 (f. 11r1-2): *karṇikāyāṃ nyased devīṃ parā<m> ekākṣarāṃ śubhām // utkṛ((kṛi)ṣṭasphaṭikaprakhyāṃ samantād amṛtastavām / āpyāyanakarīṃ devīṃ par<ā>ṃ siddhipradāyikām(āt) //;* cf. *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* quoted at TĀV 9 (15) 167, 4-6: *tasyāḥ śikhāgre vinyasyet parām ekākṣarāṃ śubhām / utkṛṣṭasphaṭikaprakhyāṃ samantād amṛtasravām // āpyāyanakarīṃ devīṃ parāṃ siddhipradāyikām /; MālVijUT 8.74cd: parāṃ cāpyāyanīm devīṃ candrakoṭyayutaprabhām //.*

(23) These are taught in SiYogM *paṭalas* 11 and 12.

(24) SiYogM 11.3c-12: *mṛtyuñjayaṃ samāsena kathyamānaṃ śṛṇu priye // ākāśa<ṃ> bhūtanilayaṃ tatra padmākṛtiṃ smaret / dalāṣṭakasamopetaṃ karṇikādhi(di)ṣṭhitaṃ sitam // svacchasphaṭika(?. prakṛti)samkāśam prāleyāvanisamnibham / sarvāmṛtamayaṃ divyaṃ can-drakalpitakarṇikam // tādṛśenaiva rūpeṇa bhūpadmaṃ tu manoramam / tasmiṃś caivopaviṣṭas tu samyag nyāsakṛtas tataḥ // prā(a)leyābhaṃ tato' - tmānam śuddhasphaṭikasa(sam)prabham / evaṃ vicintya-m(n)-ātmānaṃ paścād dhyānaṃ vicintayet // vyomapadme tu yac candraṃ karṇikāyāṃ vyavasthitam / ta<t>sthāṃ vicintayed devīṃ parā<ṃ> surabhirūpiṇīṃ // svacchasphaṭikasaprakhyāṃ samantād amṛtasravā(a)m / sravantī sāmṛtaṃ (?. sravantīṃsā-mayaṃ) divyaṃ mantra(yanta)nādāntasarpiṇi<m> // sā śakti<r> devadevasya paramātmā-.(a)mṛtavāhinī / *sā sravantī(ntīm)* param kṣīraṃ yat tat satyam sunirmalam // tat patad dhy ā(?. ntya)tmano mūrtau(tiṃ) samantāc ca vicintayet / viśa<d> brahmabile *bhānhyo* plāvayed dhṛd-(hriṃ)guhāśrayam(yāt) // evaṃ pratidinaṃ dhyāyej japen mantrottamottamam / ṣaṇmāsāj jīn(v)ate mṛtyum iti śāstrasya niścayaḥ(m) //.*

cience, and he is to imagine it first entering his mouth and then emerging from it. We are also told that she is to be visualized within a grove of *kadamba* trees (Nauclea Cadamba), holding the Book of All Wisdom in her left hand and a rosary of crystal in her right, and wearing a long necklace of the same substance.[25]

2.7.1. The essentials of this *sādhana* are also found in the *Prapañcasāra* attributed to Śaṅkara, in the chapter on the cult of the goddess Tripurabhairavī (one of the basic forms of Tripurasundarī):[26]

> If he meditates on the last of the three seed-syllables he will be free of the danger of reincarnation after his death and will win the favour of the [goddess of] Eloquence-and-Learning. He must visualize a lotus [in his heart] and this [syllable] gleaming white as the moon or jasmine in its centre. He must then visualize the goddess of the syllable holding a book and a rosary, then imagine the alphabet pouring forth from her mouth again and again, [rising up from his heart] and emerging from his mouth in an unbroken stream.

The goddess in this visualization is certainly identical with the Trika's Parā. For the seed-syllable which she embodies in this meditation is *hsrauḥ,* the third in the tripartite *mantra* of Tripurabhairavī (*hsraiṃ-hsklrīm-hsrauḥ*).[27] It is therefore equivalent to *sauḥ,* the seed-syllable of Parā in the Trika;[28] for this *hsraiṃ-hsklrīm-hsrauḥ* is an inflection of *aiṃ-klīṃ-sauḥ,* the matrix *mantra* in the Tripurasundarī cult.[29]

_____

(25) SiYogM 12.4-11: *dhyātvā parāṃ svarūpeṇa(jāyena) vyomapadmāsane sthitām / vāmahaste niviṣṭena sarvajñānamayena tu // pustakena varārohe dakṣine<na> tataḥ punaḥ / sphāṭikenā(cā)kṣasūtreṇa divyena pravareṇa tu / kadambagolakākāraiḥ sthūlajvālāvalīdharaiḥ / granthitāṃ divyarūpā(a)ṃ tu mālā<ṃ> hi gala(ti)saṃsthitām // āpādalambanī cāsau sphaṭikābhā samantataḥ / sravantīm amṛtaṃ divyaṃ kadambavanamadhyagām // udgiranti- <ṃ> mahā-oghai<ḥ> sarvajñānamayaṃ tataḥ / mukhe svake viśad(ṃ) dhyāye<t> tadrū- paṃ(āś) caivam ātmanaḥ // evaṃ kṛtvā tataḥ paścāt svavaktrāc <c>āmṛtaṃ mahān / oghaiś caiva tu śāstrāṇāṃ cintayet sādhakottamaḥ // evaṃ dhyānaṃ prayuñjīta tatas tasya(tasca) prajāyate / kavitvaṃ māsamātreṇa sālaṅkāra<ṃ> manoharam // jāyate niścitaṃ devi sarvārthapratipādakam / ṣaḍbhi<r> māsaiḥ(e) svayaṃ kartā śāstrāṇāṃ jāyate tu saḥ //.*

(26) PrapañcS 9.42: *antyaṃ bījam athendukundaviśadaṃ saṃcintya cittāmbuje tadbhūtāṃ dhṛtapustakākṣavalayāṃ devīṃ muhus tanmukhāt / udyantaṃ nikhilākṣaraṃ nijamukhenānāratasrotasā niryāntaṃ ca nirastasaṃsṛtibhayo bhūyāt sa vāgvallabhaḥ //.*

(27) See PrapañcS 9.3 and ŚārTil 12.3-5 for the *uddhāra* of this *mantra* of Tripurabhairavī. For her visualization see, e.g., PrapañcS 9.8 and ŚārTil 12.31. She is close to Parā in that she shows the gesture of knowledge and the rosary with her principal hands, and the two common or supplementary gestures of protection and generosity with the other two. But she is red, wears a garland of severed heads, and her breasts are smeared with blood. A drawing of this goddess is given in PuraścArṇ, *dhyeyadevatācitrāṇi,* p. 23.

(28) The *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava,* the root-āgama of this cult, is conscious of this identity: *śaktibīje parā śaktir icchaiva śivarūpiṇī* (4.18ab).

(29) Jñānārṇ *paṭalas* 6-9 and ŚVidyārṇT 115a20-119b13. See also ŚārTilPĀ 10, 5-6 concerning Bālā *(aiṃ-klīṃ-sauḥ): [tripura]bhairavyādīnām api sa eva [mantro] mūlabhūtaḥ.*

2.7.2. The south Indian literature of the Tripurasundarī cult, (mainly commentaries and manuals, but also in the case of the *Yoginīhṛdaya,* scripture itself[30]), was permeated by the non-dualism of the Kashmirian exegetes of the Trika. Here we see that the influence of the Trika goes right back to the very formation of this cult, since the *mantra*s are inevitably the most basic constituents of any Tantric system. Like the Kubjikā cult it has incorporated and inflected elements central to the Trika.[31]

2.7.3. It has incorporated not merely the *mantra* but also the two specific functions which are associated with its *sādhana*s in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*: the defeat of death and the granting of eloquence and knowledge. We have just seen its application to the second of these goals in the *Prapañcasāra.* Its application to the first is evident in the *mantra*s Mṛtasaṃjīvanī [Parā] ('Parā Who-restores-the-dead-to-life') and Mṛtyuñjayaparā ('Parā-as-conqueror-of-death') which occur among the Throne-goddesses *(siṃhāsanadevyaḥ)* of Tripurasundarī in the Kālīmata subsystem taught in the *Dakṣiṇamūrtisaṃhitā.*[32] The second of these carries the book and the rosary, like the Parā taught for eloquence and learning in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Prapañcasāra.*[33] The first too is white and two-armed; but instead of the book and the gesture or the book and the rosary she has the rosary and the gesture.[34]

2.8.1. As I have shown elsewhere, the influence of the Trika is even more pervasive in the case of the cult of Kubjikā.[35] The *Kubjikāmata,* the root text of the cult, also incorporated the Trika's meditation on Parā for the attainment of eloquence. The goddess is described there as white and two-armed, displaying all three of the hand-attributes seen in the variants above, since the hand that holds

_____

(30) For evidence that the *Yoginīhṛdaya* is south Indian see my forthcoming 'Dualism and Non-dualism in the Tantras.'

(31) For evidence that the Trika predates the cults of Kubjikā and Tripurasundarī see my arguments at CNRS 1986, 164-65 and Sanderson 1988, 687-88.

(32) Mṛtasaṃjīvanī: *hrīṃ haṃ saḥ saṃjīvani jūṃ haṃ saḥ kuru kuru sauḥ sauḥ svāhā*; see ŚVidyārṇT 118a31-32. Mṛtyuñjayaparā: *vada vada vāgvādini hsaiṃ klinne kledini mahākṣobhaṃ kuru kuru hsrīṃ oṃ mokṣaṃ kuru kuru hsauḥ*; see ibid. 118b10-11. The seed-syllabe *hsauḥ* is an ectype of Parā's *sauḥ* in the Trika itself; see TĀV 12 (31) 188, 13-14 (quoting the *Triśirobhairava*).

(33) See ŚVidyārṇT 11b18-19 *(Dakṣiṇamūrtisaṃhitā): pustakaṃ vāmahastena dakṣinenākṣasūtrakam / bibhratīṃ kundadhavalāṃ kumārīṃ cintayet parām //.*

(34) See ŚVidyārṇT 118b1-2 *(Dakṣiṇamūrtisaṃhitā): karpūrābhāṃ hīramuktābhūṣaṇair bhūṣitāmbarām / jñānamudrām akṣamālāṃ dadhatīṃ cintayet parām //.*

(35) See my evidence at CNRS 1986, 163-64, Goudriaan and Schoterman 1988, xii (> 14-24, 488-96).

the rosary does so in the gesture of consciousness *(cinmudrā)*.[36] However, this deviation is superficial, since the rosary and the gesture are synonymous.[37]

2.8.2. In a series of Newar ink drawings of Tantric deities belonging to this cult we see a representation of the six-faced, twelve armed Kubjikā in the embrace of her dancing consort, the ten-armed, five-faced Navātman. Beneath this is a drawing of a four-armed goddess showing the book in her outer left hand, the rosary and the gesture of consciousness in the outer right, and the common or supplementary gestures of protection and generosity in her inner left and right. The manuscript identifies her as Kubjikeśvarī. This tells us no more than that she is some form of the system's principal deity; but she is probably to be seen as an elaboration of the two-armed form just discussed.[38]

2.8.3. Also related is the one-faced, four-armed form of Kubjikā taught in the *Kubjikāmata* and the *Nityāhnikatilaka* as one of two alternatives to the six-faced, twelve-armed icon which is the goddess's principal form. According to the first source she carries a book, pot *(kamaṇḍaluḥ)* and rosary, and shows the gesture of generosity.[39] According to the second, she shows the gestures of protection and generosity, and holds a rosary and a pot.[40]

---

(36) KubjM 6.30c-33: *cakramadhye ca saṃcintya suśuklāṃ ca parāparām // pustaka-vyagrahastāṃ ca jñānamudrādharāṃ tathā / sphāṭikenākṣasūtreṇa sarvābharaṇabhūṣitām // sragdāmalambitagalāṃ prabhāmaṇḍalamaṇḍitām / dvibāhu-r-ekavadanāṃ candrakoṭyayuta-prabhām // udgiran-tī<m> mahaughena śāstrakoṭīr anekaśaḥ / evaṃdhyānasamāviṣṭaḥ sākṣād vāgīśvaro bhavet /.* Cf. the visualization text of the SiYogM quoted above, n. 25. The expression *parāparām* in this passage does not mean that the Trika goddess here is Parāparā rather than Parā. The anonymous commentary on the long redaction of the *Kubjikāmata*, the ṢaṭsāhTipp, glosses it with *sthūlasūkṣmām* '[both] gross and subtle' (f. 46v4). It also explains, ibid., how the goddess shows the three attributes with only two hands: *jñānamudrāvalambanena sphaṭikākṣasūtrahastena...*

(37) When the worshippers of Tripurasundarī show the *mudrās* of the goddess's hands during their regular cult *(nityakarma)* they show the *jñānamudrā (/cinmudrā, bodhamudrā)* twice: once for the hand that shows this gesture and once for the hand that holds the rosary. The *jñānamudrā* and the *akṣasūtramudrā* are thus synonymous; see JñānārṇT 4.40c-41b quoted above, n. 17. The gesture of consciousness/wisdom suggests the presence of the rosary in the hand that shows it. The KubjM's icon makes this presence explicit.

(38) Reproduced in Rawson 1978, 19 without identification. The connection of these drawings with the cult of Kubjikā, but not their precise identities, was first pointed out by Schoterman (1982: 10, n. 7, acknowledging K.R. van Kooy).

(39) KubjM 17.18: *kaumārakramamadhyasthā ekavaktrā caturbhujā / pustaka-maṇḍaludharā akṣasūtravarapradā //.*

(40) NityāhnTil f. 28v4-29rl: *yuvākramo yathā: ekavaktrā caturbhujā abhayavara-dākṣamālākamaṇḍaludharā //.*

2.8.4. In the *Kularatnoddyota* an expanded version of this alternative *dhyāna* is prescribed. The goddess is five-faced and ten-armed. She shows the gestures of generosity, protection, and knowledge *(jñāna-mudrā)*, and holds a book and a rosary, a noose and a goad, a bow and a cluster of five arrows, and a skull-cup filled with wine.[41] She appears to fuse an elaboration of the Trika's Parā with Tripura-sundarī; for the noose, goad, bow and five arrows are the hallmark of the latter.[42]

2.8.5. Parā appears in another variant in the *[Kubjikā-]Nityāhnikati-laka*. There she is to be visualized emerging from her seed-syllable, white, seated on a bull, showing the gesture, the trident and lotus (or lotuses).[43] We are not told how many hands the goddess has. If the lotus is a separate hand-attribute, then the text remains silent on a least one hand, their number always being even. We do not need to assume, however, that she has more than two hands; for the ambiguous compound *śūlābja-* may refer not to a trident and a single lotus but to three lotuses visualized on the cusps of the trident itself as the thrones of deities. Such a design is seen in the basic initiation *maṇḍala* of the Trika (the *[tri]śūlābjamaṇḍala*).[44] That the deity should hold such a trident is also paralleled : the *Siddhayogeśvarī-mata* teaches a *yāga* in which Parā, Parāparā and Aparā (the three goddesses who are enthroned on the lotuses on the tips of the trident in the *maṇḍala*) are to be installed on the three cusps of a trident visualized in the hand of Bhairava.[45] That a form of Parā should be visualized carrying a trident which enthrones not only the other two goddesses but also herself might appear illogical and therefore implausible. In fact it is entirely appropriate, since the goddess here

---

(41) KulRatnU f. 66r (... *yuvākrame*).

(42) See, e.g., Nityāṣoḍ 1.130 - 146. A finely executed painting in the Kangra style of Tripurasundarī seated in a pavilion on the prostate body of Sadāśiva is reproduced in Rawson 1973, 124 (Ill. 105: "Mahavidya icon.").

(43) NityāhnTil f. 42v3-4: ... *tadudbhavām / mūrti<ṃ>śuklām uṛsasthitām vyākhyāśūlābjadhāriṇīṃ / tattvatrayamayī<ṃ>devīṃ jaṭākhaṇḍenduśekharā<m> /.* The word *vyākhyā* in this passage = *vyākhyānamudrā*, 'the gesture of text-exposition.' Presumably this = *cinmudrā* here.

(44) For the exact outline of this *maṇḍala* drawn following the instructions of the *Mālinīvijayottara* see Sanderson 1986, 171.

(45) SiYogM 25.44c-49b: *tatas tu kṣatajam gṛhya vāmāṅgād uttamād budhaḥ // bhai-ravyā sahitam devaṃ bhairavam pūrva(rṇa)varṇitam / śaṅkhamadhye likhed vidvān triśūlam(e) dakṣiṇe kare // jvālayā *rnmāca* saṃkāśaṃ tribhiḥ śṛṅgaiḥ (tribhisyāṅgaiḥ) sujājvalam / bhairaviśahitam devam pūrvavac cāsane sthitam // triśūlasthāṃ parāṃ devīṃ tathā caiva parāparām / aparāṃ devadeveśi(e) yajet pūrvavad eva hi // dakṣiṇe caiva śūlāgre nyased devīṃ parāparām / ekonaiś(akākāraiś) ca śubhair varṇaiś catvāriṃśatir(ur) eva hi / vāme sārdhatrivarṇenaikārṇām(?.atyarṇṇe) madhye parāṃ nyaset /.*

is not simply Parā but the icon of the Trividyā, a *mantra* peculiar to the Kubjikā cult, which runs together all three of the *mantras* (Parā, Parāparā and Aparā) into a single whole.[46]

2.9. According to the *Piṅgalāmata*, a Śaiva āgama of the Bhairava canon dealing with the installation *(pratiṣṭhā)* of idols and other substrates of worship,[47] all three of the Trika's goddesses when painted as a group are to carry tridents. According to the same source they must be three-faced.[48] This unusual feature is shared with, and may have been derived from, the Trika goddesses of the lost *Triśirobhairava*. No visualization texts from that text are quoted in our literature; but the title ('[The Tantra of] Bhairava the Three-headed') and a section of the *Jayadrathayāmala* suggest this. The section in question is clearly based on the *Triśirobhairava* system and it teaches that Parā Triśīrṣā should be visualized with this feature.[49]

2.10.1. There are also four-armed forms of Parā. The *Trikasāra* teaches an icon of this kind, though without telling us what implements or gestures her hands display. She is said to be white, four-armed, four-faced, and surrounded by her standard retinue: the twelve Yoginīs who embody the 'fertile' vowels *(a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, e, ai, o, au, aṃ* [anusvāra], and *aḥ* [visarga]).[50] The purpose of the cult is the attainment of eloquence and learning.[51]

2.10.2. Here too the literature of the cult of Tripurasundarī shows parallels. The *Saundaryalaharī*, a work which, like the *Prapañcasāra*, is attributed to Śaṅkara, praises without name a white, four-armed manifestation of the goddess who holds a crystal rosary and a book, and shows the common gestures (of protection *[abhayamudrā]* and generosity *[varadamudrā]*), saying that her cult bestows 'sweetness

of speech.'[52] There is also a four-armed Parā in the second of the two functions, namely the conquest of death, which is taught for the *sādhana* of the third seed-syllable of the *mantra* of Tripurasundarī in the *Jñānārṇava* and the *Kaulāvalīnirṇaya*.[53] She is to be visualized holding a jar full of lunar nectar and showing the gestures of consciousness, generosity and protection.[54]

2.10.3. Finally there is the four-armed deity who embodies the *mantras* Prāsādaparā *(hsauṃḥ)* and Parāprāsāda *(s-hauṃḥ)*, variants of the Trika's Parā *(sauḥ)*, at the centre of the Kaula system of the *Kulārṇavatantra*.[55] This deity, who may be visualized as male (= Śiva), female (= Śakti), or as both in one body (Ardhanārīśvara), shows the gesture of consciousness and carries the book, the drinking vessel *(pānapātram)*, and the trident.[56]

---

(46) See below, nn. 73 and 74.

(47) For the place and scope of this important text see my forthcoming 'Dualism and Non-dualism in the Tantras.' MSS: NAK 3 / 376 (AD 1169/70); 5 / 1929; British Library MS Or. 2279 (AS 1193/94).

(48) PiṅgM 5.37c-38b: *parādyāḥ śūlahastās tu triśiras(as) tu tripadmake / svaśāstrok-tyāthavā likhya cakrasaṃsthāthā paṅktigāḥ //.*

(49) JayadYāmT 4, ff. 187v3-199r3. See also below, n. 127.

(50) TĀV 2 (3) 236, 6-7: *parām tv ekākṣarām madhye śaṅkhakundendusundarām / caturbhujām caturvaktrām yoginīdvādaśāvṛtām //.*

(51) TĀV 2 (3) 236, 15 qu. the *Trikasāra: athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi vāgvidhānam anuttamam /.*

(52) SaundLah 15: *śarajjyotsnāśubhrām śaśiyutajaṭājūṭamakuṭām varatrāsatrāṇasphaṭ-ikaguṭikāpustakakarām / sakṛn na tvā natvā katham iva satāṃ samnidadhate madhukṣīradrākṣ-āmadhurīnā bhaṇitayaḥ //.* This visualization is illustrated in the Baroda MS; see ibid. p. 178, plate 10a. The commentator Lakṣmīdhara has the reading *sphaṭikaghaṭikā* in the second *pāda.* He takes it to mean 'crystal cup' *(sphaṭikapānapātram)*; see SaundLahL 104,4; also LaghSt 7 and AmbSt 14.

(53) JñānārṇT 19.28c-34b (= KaulāvN 16.150-56). The verses elaborate a passage in the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* (4.47-50), which teaches an aniconic *sādhana* of this syllabe.

(54) JñānārṇT 19.29b-31c (= KaulāvN 16.150d-52): ... *śarīre cintayet parām / sravatpīyū-ṣadhārābhir varṣantīṃ viṣahāriṇīṃ // hemaprabhābhāsamānāṃ vidyunnikarasuprabhām / sphuraccandrakalāpūrṇakalaśaṃ varadābhayau // jñānamudrāṃ ca dadhatiṃ sākṣād amṛtarūpiṇīm /.*

(55) For these two seed-syllabes see KulārṇT 4.4-5b: *ananta(= ḥ)-candra(= s)-bhuva-nam(= au) indu(= ṃ)-binduyugānvitaḥ (= + ḥ) / śrīprāsādaparāmantro bhuktimuktiphala-pradaḥ // parāprāsāsamantras tu sādir (= s-hauṃḥ) uktaḥ kuleśvari /;* also MahātripV 256, 26-28. On the extraordinary combination *ṃḥ* see ŚārTilPĀ 10, 22-23: *bālāyā mantrabhedeṣu kvacid binduḥ kvacid visargaḥ kvacid binduvisargāv apy uddhṛtau.*

(56) KulārṇT 4.112c-113b: *pānapātraṃ ca cinmudrāṃ triśūlaṃ pustakaṃ karaiḥ // vidyāsaṃsiddhiṃ bibhrāṇāṃ sadānandamukhekṣaṇām /.*

2.11.

2.11. Table. Visualizations of Parā.

SOURCE	COLOUR	FACES	ARMS	RIGHT	LEFT
PTTātDīp ParaśurKS RahPañc (1) Sahajānanda Lalitop AhirbSaṃ	White	1	2	Gesture of Consciousness (G of C)	Book
RahPañc (2)	White	1	2	Pen	Book
SiYogM PrapañcS DakṣMSaṃ (1)	White	1	2	Crystal Rosary (CRos)	Book
DakṣMSaṃ (2)	White	1	2	CRos	G of C
KubjM	White	1	2	CRos, G of C	Book
NityāhnTil	White	1	-	G of C	Trident-and lotuses
PiṅgM	White	3	-	-	Trident
Trikasāra	White	4	4	-	-
SaundLah	White	1	4	CRos Protection	Book Generosity
JñānārṇT KaulāvN	?[57]	1	4	G of C Protection	Jar of Nectar Generosity
KulārṇT	-	1	4	G of C Cup of Nectar	Book Trident

(57) Her colour is not stated precisely. She is said to be radiant with the lustre of gold and to resemble a mass of lightning (JñānārṇT 19. 30ab [= KaulāvN 16. 151cd]: *hemaprabhābhāsamānāṃ vidyunnikarasuprabhām /*). She might therefore be thought to be golden. However, according to the commentator Vidyānanda (see NityāṣoḍARĀ 247²¹ and 248¹⁴), the Śakti of the seed-syllable is white in the aniconic visualization (taught at Nityāṣoḍ 4.47) which is the substratum of this icon.

3.0. Her colour, her association with eloquence and learning, and, above all, the attributes of her hands, show that Parā is an ectype of the goddess Sarasvatī, more precisely of Sarasvatī as embodiment of the Word (Vāgīśvarī) or, which is the same conception, of the alphabet (Mātṛkāsarasvatī, Lipidevī).

3.1. Thus the Mātṛkāsarasvatī of the *Prapañcasāra* and the closely related *Śāradātilaka* shows the gesture of consciousness, carries the book, the rosary and the jar or skull-cup of nectar;[58] and the equivalent goddess of the *Agnipurāṇa* and other texts, known as Lipidevī or Vāgīśvarī, carries the book, the rosary, the jar, and a lotus.[59] The Sarasvatī of the Kashmirian *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* (3.73.25) carries the rosary, the book, the water-jar *(kamaṇḍaluḥ)* and the trident;[60] the many-armed Vidyāvidyeśvarī form of Sarasvatī taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala* holds the Book of All Knowledge and the crystal rosary in her two principal (i.e. innermost) hands, and like Parā, she is to be visualized pouring forth nectar from her

(58) PrapañcS 7.3: *pañcāśadvarṇabhedair vihitavadanadoḥpādayukkukṣivakṣodeśāṃ bhāsvatkapardākalitaśaśikalām indukundāvadātām / akṣasrakkumbhacintālikhitavarakarāṃ trīkṣaṇām padmasaṃsthām acchākalpām atucchastanajaghanabharāṃ bhāratīṃ tāṃ namāmi //.* According to PrapañcSPKD ad loc. (535. 24-25) *cintā*- here = *vyākhyāna[=jñāna]-mudrā* and *likhitavara*- = *pustakavara*-; cf. Nityots 196, verse 5 quoted at n. 14 above. But this interpretation of the verse is not universal. Umānandanātha gives it as the visualization text in the installation of the Alphabet *(mātṛkānyāsaḥ)* at Nityots 94, 1-5; but he takes *cintālikhitavara*- quite differently. He divides the compound into *cintālikhita*- and *vara*- and interprets these as the book of knowledge and the gesture of generosity. He is not alone. He could have cited ŚVidyārṇT 232, 12-13, which is clearly based on this verse of PrapañcS and takes it in the same way: ... *akṣasrakkumbhaśobhitām / cintālikhitasatpāṇim samagravaradāyinīm //.* There is also ŚārTil's visualization of Lipitanu-Vāgīśvarī ('The Goddess of the Word, whose body is the Alphabet'); see 7.14cd: *bibhrāṇām aniśam varījāpavaṭīṃ vidyāṃ kapālaṃ karaiḥ //.* This is the *dhyāna* of Antarmātṛkā according to MahātripV 51, 1-17. It too is based on PrapañcS 7.3 in the second interpretation. The first interpretation, however, is the source of the *dhyāna* of Vāgīśvarī at ŚārTil 6.4: *pañcāśallipibhir vimuktamukhadoḥpanmadhyavakṣaḥsthalāṃ bhāsvanmaulinibaddhacandraśakalām āpīnatuṅgastanīm / mudrām akṣaguṇaṃ sudhāḍhyakalaśaṃ vidyāṃ* [i.e. *pustakam*] *ca hastāmbujair bibhrāṇāṃ viśadaprabhām trinayanāṃ vāgdevatām āśraye //.* ĪśānŚGDPaddh MP 17.64cd is also based on the first interpretation: *sabodhamudrapustakāṃ sakumbhajāpyamālikāṃ sitāmbarādibhūṣitām sitāvṛtim numo giram //.*

(59) AgnP 293.51: *lipidevī sākṣasūtrakumbhapustakapadmadhṛk / kavitvādi prayacchet ...;* AgnikPaddh f.71r 8-13: *dorbhir yuktāṃ caturbhiḥ sphaṭikamaṇimayīm akṣamālām dadhānāṃ hastenaikena padmaṃ sitam api caṣakam pustakam cāpareṇa / yā sā kundenduśaṅkhasphaṭikamaṇinibhā bhāsamānāsamānā sā me vāgdevateyam nivasatu vadane sarvadā suprasannā //.*

(60) ViṣṇDhUP 3.73.25: *caturbhujā tu kartavyā tathā devī sarasvatī / akṣamālā triśūlaṃ ca pustakam ca kamaṇḍalum / ...*

mouth into the *sādhaka*'s;[61] and Dūtī, the 'mother of *mantras*' *(mantramātā)* who is worshipped as the goddess of the bell rung in Tantric ritual, carries the book and rosary, and shows the gestures of protection and generosity.[62]

3.2. Of these various hand-attributes of Sarasvatī the principal are the book and the rosary, the two items held by the Parā of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*.[63] It is because these are the fundamental attributes that they are held by Sarasvatī's two-armed retinue-śak-tis,[64] and by almost all the numerous variants of the alphabet-goddess Mātṛkā taught in the cult of Tripurasundarī.[65]

3.3. The pen *(lekhanī, tūlikā)*, which takes the place of the gesture of consciousness in the second visualization of the *Rahasyapañcadaś-ikā*, is also characteristic of Sarasvatī. Indeed the visualization of the ten-syllabled *(daśākṣarī)* Vāgīśvarī which is given in the *Prapañ-casāra* agrees with this form exactly:[66]

> Seated on a spotless lotus, her lotus-like hands holding pen and book, white as jasmine or *mandāra* flowers, with the moon's cresent shining on top of her mass of braided hair, may Sarasvatī destroy for you all the terrors of existence.

---

(61) JY 2 f. 112r 4-8: *atah paratarā mūrti<r>vidyāvidyeśvarīti yā / tāṃ dhyāyet sitahārendusvacchasphaṭikasaṃnibhām // tuhinācalalakṣaughasadṛśāṃ padmamālinīm / kṣīrābdhikṣobhaśubhrābhrahaṃsāṇḍasadṛśāṃ sitām // tiryaksudhārasāvāhapūrapūritadik-taṭām / sarvābharaṇasamdoha(ā)vicitritaśarīriṇīm // sarvajñānodayaudāryasatpustaka-karāmbujām / akṣasūtra<.>gaṇanācalacitritahastikām / śukla(ra)pretamahāskandha-saṃsthitām viśvavigrahām / mahāmukuṭakeyūrahārāvalivirājitām // pāśāṅkuśakaravyagrāṃ varadābhayapāṇinīm / padmahastāṃ sunayanāṃ candrārkāruṇadhāriṇīm // prodgirantīṃ svakād vaktran nānābhāṣāḥ prabhedataḥ / svavaktram āviśantam tac cintyaṃ suravarārcite //.*

(62) KarmK 4, 216 (187d): *dūtīṃ saumyāṃ caturbāhuṃ sughoṣāṃ mantraghoṣiṇīm / akṣamālāpustakasragvarābhayakaraṃ yajet //.* There is the same verse (with *smaret* for *yajet*) at AgRah 5.883.

(63) See de Mallmann 1963: 190, 23-25.

(64) PrapañcSV 103, 20-21:... *śaktayaḥ / tāś ca śuklāḥ akṣavalayapustakadhāriṇyaḥ /* (referring to the eight Śaktis of Mātṛkāsarasvatī); and ĪśānŚGDPaddh MP 18.33ab: *sapustaka-japasrajo ... śaktayaḥ* (referring to the same).

(65) See ŚVidyārṇT 83a5 - 85b27; also Lipibhairavī at BrahmaP (Lalitop) 44.19cd-23d.

(66) PrapañcS 8.29: *amalakamalasaṃsthā lekhanīpustakodyatkarayugalasarojā kunda-mandāragaurī / dhṛtaśaśadharakhaṇḍollāsikoṭīracūḍā bhavatu bhavabhayānāṃ bhañjinī bhāratī vaḥ//.* The ten-syllabled Vāgīśvarī is *[oṃ] vada vada vāgvādini svāhā*; see ibid. 27 and ĪśānŚGDPaddh MP 18.17. In the *raśmimālā japa*-sequence in the south Indian Lalitā cult this same verse is used for the visualization of Vāgvādinī Sarasvatī *(aiṃ klīṃ sauḥ vada vāgvādini svāhā)*, worshipped as a subordinate of Śyāmā / Śyāmalā (/ Mātaṅgī, / Saṅgītamātṛkā), the 'minister' *(mantriṇī)* of the 'Empress' *(mahārājñī)* Lalitā; see Nityots 127[34], 134[5-10], 145[5].

The *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśiva teaches the same form, with the addition of the neutral or supplementary gestures of protection and generosity.[67]

4. PARĀ AND THE ALPHABET-DEITIES IN RITUAL

4.1. That the icon of Parā should be an ectype of Sarasvatī reflects the relation in ritual between Parā and the alphabet-deities. Thus in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* Parā and Mālinī are deployed in a manner which suggests that they are indeed two aspects of a single Word-Absolute. When the worshipper installs the three goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā on to the cusps of the *maṇḍala*'s trident he places Parā *and* Mālinī on the central cusp, between Parāparā on the left cusp (as seen by the *sādhaka*) and Aparā on the right. First Parāparā, Mālinī and Aparā are installed; and then Parā is installed above Mālinī.[68] Abhinavagupta, referring to this order of installation in his *Tantrāloka*, explains that Mālinī and Mātṛkā (who, he reports, may take the place of Mālinī here) are identical with Parā herself.[69] Elsewhere he identifies Parā with Mālinī as the ultimate consciousness, the thirty-seventh reality-level *(tattvam)* which is the unity and totality of the thirty-six from [Anāśrita-]Śiva down to Earth *(pṛthivī)* recognized in the common Śaiva tradition.[70]

4.2. The same interpenetration or coessentiality of Parā and the alphabet-deities (< Sarasvatī) is encoded in the Anuttara system. There, according to one interpretation of the *Parātriṃśikā* (the

---

(67) ĪśānŚGDPaddh MP18.30: *mṛgāṅkamaṇicandrikākumudaṣaṇḍakundadyutiṃ śaśāṅkaśakalollasajjaṭilamaulikāṃ trīkṣaṇām / sitāmbaravilepanām amalahārahārisrajaṃ dhṛtābhayavilekhanī(īṃ)varadapustakāṃ bhāratim //.*

(68) SiYogM 6.19-28b: *dakṣiṇe tatra śūlāgre(ye) nyased devīṃ parāparām //19//... śulāgre vinyased vāme tryakṣarā<ṃ>* [i.e. Aparāṃ; see TĀ 30.26cd] *paramā<ṃ>punaḥ // 25 // ... <madhya>me* [see TĀV 9 (15) 167, 2] *vinyased devīṃ sarvākṣaramayīm* [i.e. the alphabet-goddess] *śubhām //26// sphuratsūryāyutaprakhyāṃ dyotayantīm idam jagat / karṇikāyāṃ nyased devīṃ parām ekākṣarāṃ śubhām //27//.* That 'she who consists of all the letters' *(sarvākṣaramayī)* is Mālinī is clear from 3. 7-19b; see also TĀ 15.333-334b and commentary.

(69) TĀV 9 (15) 166, 10-13: *na kevalam ekāmaiva madhyagā parā devī yāvan mātṛketi māliniti cocyata ity āha "parā tu mātṛkā devī mālinī madhyagoditā".*

(70) TĀ 3.233-34: *bijayonisamāpattivisargodayasundarā / mālinī hi parā śaktir nirmitā viśvarūpinī // eṣā vastuta ekaiva parā kālasya karṣiṇī / śaktiśaktimadyogena yāmalatvaṃ prapadyate //;* IśvPratVivVim 2, 204, 16-20, citing the *Trikasāra: seyaṃ saptatriṃśi tattvakalā śuddhā ṣaṭtriṃśyāḥ param tattvam iti sambandhaḥ / iyatā sāratvaṃ nirmitaṃ yad vitatya śrivisamadarśanasārasāstre* [i.e. *trika(darśana)sārasāstre*] *nirūpitaṃ śaktilakṣaṇena /* (206, 18-20:) *anyatrāpi "yat sāram asya jagataḥ sā śaktir malinī parā." This quotation is from the *Trikasāra;* see IsvPratVim 1, 211.

scripture of that system), Mātṛkā / Śabdarāśi (the alphabet in the standard order from *a* to *ha* + *kṣa*) is enclosed *(samputīkṛta-)* by Parā. She *(sauḥ)* is placed at its beginning and end, and at the beginning and end of each of its fifty letters : *sauḥ sauḥ aṃ sauḥ sauḥ āṃ sauḥ sauḥ iṃ sauḥ* etc. through to *sauḥ kṣaṃ sauḥ sauḥ*[71] In another interpretation, enabling a more condensed order of worship, Mātṛkā is even more intimately fused with Parā : she is taken to be represented by the final *ḥ* of *sauḥ* itself, the rest of the seed-syllable being placed before and after it *(sau-ḥ-aus).*[72]

4.3. An elaboration of this model, known as the Tadgraha, is found in the cult of Kubjikā. The three *mantras* (or more properly *vidyās*) of the Trika's goddesses Parāparā, Aparā and Parā (in that order) become a continuous whole (the Trividyā) slightly expanded to bring the total of its syllables up to fifty. In this way it is brought into line with the two alphabet-deities Śabdarāśi and Mālinī.[73] These three sets of fifty (Trividyā, Śabdarāśi, and Mālinī) are then worked into a series of fifty units each consisting of fifteen syllables. The syllables of the Trividyā (T^{1-50}) appear one by one as the eighth (central) syllables of these fifty units of fifteen. Each is enclosed to the right and the left by the corresponding letter of the Mālinī alphabet (M^{1-50} [*na* to *pha*]), and the resulting units of three (M^n T^n

---

[71] PT 29-30b: *caturdaśābhijaptena puṣpenāsanakalpanā / tatra sṛṣṭiṃ yajed vīraḥ punar evāsanaṃ tataḥ // sṛṣṭiṃ tu samputīkṛtya paścād yajanam ārabhet /.* PTViv 278, 2-3 (265, 7-8): *samputīkaraṇaṃ sṛṣṭer ādikṣāntāyāḥ pratyekaṃ sarvaśaś ca hṛdayabījena.* The 'heart-seed' *(hṛdayabījam)* is *sauḥ.*

[72] PTLaghVṛ 21, 18 - 22, 5: *yena madhyavartivisarga ubhayakoṭigatasvara*[i.e. *au*]-*sadvṛtti*[i.e. *s*]-*sparśī;* PTTātD 401 - 409b: *yena visargo 'yaṃ tanmadhyastho(?.ā)'nubhāvataḥ;* RahPañc 27a: *sauvarṇasampuṭakamadhyabhuvi praviṣṭām;* Sahajānandanātha's hymn to Parā at Nityots 196, 9: *sauvarṇasampuṭāntaḥsthām; Parākrama* at YogHṛD 276, 4: *sauvarṇajaptaku-sumakṣepenāsanatāṃ nyaset.* In this last passage I emend the edition's *guptāditapta-* in the light of PT 29ab (evidently the authority behind this verse). The reading *guptādi-* is dittography: see the *guptādiyogināṃ* immediately before (YogHṛ 3.90c) and after (YogHṛD 276, 5). Note also the reading *sauvarṇatapta-* in several of the editor's MSS.

[73] In the Trika Parāparā has thirty-nine syllables (counting the final *ṭs* of the two *phaṭs* as half a syllable each [TĀV 12 (30) 186, 7-11]): *oṃ aghore hrīḥ paramaghore huṃ ghorarūpe haḥ ghoramukhi bhīma bhīṣaṇe vama vama piba piba he ru ru ra phaṭ huṃ haḥ phaṭ* (see TĀ 30. 20-24b); Aparā has three syllables: *hrīḥ hūṃ phaṭ* (TĀ 30.20cd); and Parā has one: *sauḥ* (see TĀ 30.27ab). In the cult of Kubjikā (the Paścimāmnāya) as taught in the KubjM Parāparā has forty-two and a half syllables: *aiṃ aghore hrīṃ hsaḥ paramaghore huṃ ghorarūpe hsauṃ ghoramukhi bhīma bhīṣaṇe vama vama piva haḥ he ru ru ra ra hrīṃ hūṃ phaṭ (uddhāra* at KubjM 18.4-24); Aparā has six and a half: *aiṃ hrīṃ hrūṃ phrem huṃ phaṭ* (see ibid. 25-29); and Parā remains mono-syllabic: *hsrūauṃ* (see ibid. 30-31). When the three are taught as a continuous whole (the Trividyā) there are minor variations, though the syllables are always fifty; see NityahnTil f. 42v2 - 44v4 *(trividyānyāsaḥ)* and KubjM 24.36. In the latter only 49 syllables are 'raised'; but 18.56 suggests that *aiṃ,* the opening syllable, should be repeated at the end.

M^n) are enclosed in turn by the corresponding Śabdarāśi letters (S^{1-50} [*a* to *kṣa*]) : S^n M^n T^n M^n S^n. Finally each of these sets of five is enclosed on each side by a set of five syllables known as the *praṇavas* and serving, as it were, as the signature or hallmark of the Kubjikā cult (P^{1-5} [*aiṃ hrīṃ śrīṃ phrem hsauḥ*]) S^n M^n T^n M^n S^n P^{5-1} [*hsauḥ phrem śrīṃ hrīṃ aiṃ*]).[74]

The Trividyā of this complex is visualized as either of the two icons of Parā given above from the *Kubjikāmata* and the *Nityāhnika-tilaka.*[75] It appears, therefore, that it was seen not merely as the combination of all three of the *mantras (vidyās)* of the Trika goddesses, but also as Parā in her transcendental aspect, that is, as Parā as the unity of the three.[76] We may say, then, that Parā is presented here as the core and the two alphabet-deities Mālinī and Śabdarāśi as the retinue.

4.4. In the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāva* this relation is reversed. There Parā, Parāparā and Aparā are the emanations of the alphabet-deities. In the centre of the initiation *maṇḍala* of that āgama the officiant *(ācāryaḥ)* installs Mātṛkā as Bhairava with Mālinī as his consort, and surrounds them with circuits *(āvaraṇāni)* of female powers. Among these we find Parā, Parāparā and Aparā, in their customary circuits of twelve, eight and three Yoginīs.[77]

4.5. Parā's intimate relation with the alphabet is also apparent from the *Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā* of the southern Pañcarātra. For she is

---

[74] KubjM 18.32: *praṇavoccārasaṃyuktā vidyā tattvatrayātmikā / śabdamālinīmūrtisthā vidyādehaguṇojjvalā //.* For the manner in which these three sets of fifty are combined see ṢaṭsāhTipp on *paṭala* 11, f. 42v6-: *tadgrahaṃ tac ca vyāvarṇayiṣye / yathātripañcāśapradhānaṃ / yathā mālinī pañcāśavarṇā / śabdarāśiḥ pañcāśavarṇā / trividyā pañcāśavarṇā / iti / tripañcāśapradhānaṃ / kathaṃ tasya vinyāsaḥ / yathā / "vidyākṣaraṃ daden madhye mālinipadamadhyagaṃ / śabdarāśipadaṃ tadvat pañcapraṇavamadhyataḥ / anulomavilomena nyāsaḥ samparikīrtitaḥ" // iti //.*

[75] The first icon (see above n. 36 citing KubjM 6.30c-33) is prescribed for the Trividyā at ṢaṭSāhTipp 46v5 - 47r6 *(iti vāgīśvarītrividyāsthūlasūkṣmadhyānam //).* For the prescription of the second see above n. 43.

[76] For these two aspects of Parā (as one of the three and as the their sum and unity) see Sanderson 1986, 194.

[77] TanSadbh f. 17r12- : *bhairavaṃ pūjayet tatra pañcāśārṇa(?. śe)śarīriṇam / tadut-saṅgagatāṃ devīṃ nādiphāntasvarūpiṇīm* [i.e. *mālinīm*] */ vidyāṅgaiś ca samopetāṃ sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitām / dvibhujā<ṃ> padmahastām(aṃ) tu sitapadmāsane sthitām / vargākhyāś cāṣṭabhiḥ patrair yādihāntakrameṇa tu / aghoryādye(?.āste)kavarṇaṃ tu patrāgre tu niveśayet / dvātriṃśavarṇavinyāsaṃ dvātriṃśe viniyojayet / parā<ṃ> dvādaśabhedena dvādaśāre prayojayet / tryarake tu tatas cakre samyag jñātvā yathāvidhi / aparāṃ pūjya yatnena vidhidṛṣṭena karmaṇā / kesaraiḥ śaktayaḥ pūjyā yakārādi yathākramam /...*

worshipped in the ritual of that text as a deity of the alphabet *(mātṛkācakram)* itself, not merely in association with it.[78]

4.6. This same view of Parā as goddess of the alphabet, that is, as a variant of Mātṛkāsarasvatī, is found in the rituals of Tripura-sundarī. Bālā, a major form of that popular goddess and the object of an independent cult,[79] is worshipped upon a *yantra* containing the letters of the alphabet.[80] She is evidently Parā's double, as we can see from the visualization given in the *Jñānārṇavatantra*, her principal āgama.[81] She is described there as white, white-robed, adorned with pearls, with the new moon upon her hair, three-eyed, and four-armed, holding the book and rosary, and showing the two common gestures. Her association with the Trika finds further expression in the detailed account of her worship *(Bālāpaddhati)* in the *Devīrahasya*. In the version of the *Jñānārṇavatantra* one worships twelve Śaktis in a circle around her, installs above them the five Transcended Deities *(pañcapretāsanam*: Brahmā, Viṣṇu,

---

(78) AhirbSaṃ 24. 14-19 give the icons of Mātṛkā, Cintāmaṇi, Parā, Parāvarā and Śrī as the deities of the *mātṛkācakram*. For the icon of Parā at 24. 16 see above, p. 5, n. 1. That Parā should appear in this rôle in a Vaṣṇava text is unexpected. But the whole text is pervaded by the influence of the Trika, and nowhere more than in its sixteenth chapter, in which its alphabet-cosmogony *(mātṛkāvarṇotpattiḥ)* is based directly of indirectly on the third chapter of Abhinavagupta's TĀ. The identity of the AhirbSaṃ's Parā is confirmed by 23. 107cd which gives her *mantra: parā nāma mahāvidyā somasthaurvasthasṛṣṭikā*, 'the great *vidyā* called Parā consists of Emission [*ḥ*] on Aurva [*au*] on Soma[*s*].'

(79) See, e.g., the *Bālāpañcāṅga* which is the fourth *Pariśiṣṭa* of the *Devīrahasya*. Here we see her as one of the principal family goddesses *(kuladevī)* of the Kashmirian brahmins, the other *Pañcāṅgas* in these *Pariśiṣṭas* being those of Jvālāmukhī, Śārikā, and Mahārājñī. Bālādevī has a pīṭha at Bālᵃhōṃ (< Skt. Bālāśrama), a village about a mile to the north-east of Pāmpar (< Skt. Padmapura) in the Vihi Pargaṇa; see Stein 1900, II 459; and KaśmDTīrthSaṃ f. 24r2-3: *bālāśrame bālā tripurā devī saralavṛkṣāśritā*, '...at the foot of a Deodar pine'.

(80) See JñānārṇT 3. 6-21 for the diagram and the distribution of the letters.

(81) JñānārṇT 3. 27c-36: *muktārekhālasadratnatilakāṃ mukuṭojjvalām //27 // viśuddha-muktāratnādhyāṃ candrarekhākirīṭinīm / bhramadbhramaranīlābhanayanatrayarājinīm // 28 // sūryabhāsvanmahāratnakuṇḍalālaṅkṛtām parām / śukrākārasphuranmuktāhārabhūṣa-ṇābhūṣitām // 29 // graiveyāṅgadamuktābhiḥ sphuratkāntivirājitām / gaṅgātaraṅgakarpūraśu-bhrāmbaravirājitām // 30 // nakṣatramālāsaṃkāśamuktāmañjīramaṇḍitām // 33 // vāmena pāṇinaikena pustakaṃ cāpareṇa tu / abhayaṃ ca prayacchantīṃ sādhakāya varānane // 34 // akṣamālāṃ ca varadaṃ dakṣapāṇidvayena hi / dadhatīṃ cintayed devīṃ vaśya-saubhāgyavākpradām // 35 // kṣīrakundendudhavalām prasannāṃ saṃsmaret priye // 36 // iti tripureśvarīdhyānaṃ nāma tṛtīyaḥ paṭalaḥ //*. This visualization text is incorporated in the *Bālāpañcāṅga* of the *Devīrahasya*, pp. 492-493. Because Bālā is a form of Tripurasundarī, she is sometimes visualized in the manner of Tripurasundarī as red and red-robed (see, e.g., ibid. pp. 482-483 and p. 503) or even further hybridized by the substitution of the noose *(pāśaḥ)* and the goad *(aṅkuśaḥ)* proper to Tripurasundarī for the two gestures of Bālā's extra hands (see, e.g., ibid. p. 500). See also PuraścArṇ p. 806 on these three variants. The white, white-robed form, is evidently original.

Rudra, Īśvara and Sadāśiva), and then installs Bālā on this throne. In the account of the *Devīrahasya* the series of Śaktis is extended: after installing the twelve on the petals of the throne-lotus one installs Manonmanī in their centre, and then the three goddesses Parā, Aparā and Parāparā [above them], before making obeisance to Sadāśiva, the Great Transcended *(mahāpretaḥ)*, the highest of the five and the only one mentioned in this version.[82] The order would be more rational if Sadāśiva were worshipped after Manonmanī, the three goddesses of the Trika after him, and Bālā above the three as their unity. For this is the order in the Trika proper. There Sadāśiva, the Great Transcended, is installed below the three goddesses in the centre of the central lotus just underneath the base of the central cusp. The three goddesses are worshipped above him on lotuses upon each of the cusps, and the fourth goddess (Parā in her transcen-dental aspect) above these.[83] It seems likely, then, that the text-of-ritual preserved in the *Devīrahasya* is the result of a compro-mise. Its formulators want to say that Bālā is not just Parā, but Parā in her higher role as the unitary ground of all three; but they have kept Sadāśiva at the end of the throne-series because that is his place in the original version of the throne taught in the *Jñānārṇava-tantra*.

That this goddess is not simply Mātṛkā, but rather a reflex of Parā as the essence of Mātṛkā, is evident from the fact that the text gives a separate visualization for Mātṛkā proper:[84] she too is white, adorned with pearls, and white-robed, with the crescent of the moon on her hair, and she too carries the book and the rosary; but while Bālā shows the gestures of generosity and protection, Mātṛkā has a water-jar *(kamaṇḍaluḥ)* in place of the latter.

4.7. Finally, there is the evidence of the similarity between the

---

(82) Devīrah 492[11-15]: *patreṣu vāmāyai* - [i.e. *namaḥ*] / *jyeṣṭhāyai* - / *raudryai* - / *ambikāyai* - / *icchāyai* - / *jñānāyai* - / *kriyāyai* / *kubjikāyai* - / *citrāyai* - / *viṣaghnikāyai* - / *dūtaryai* - / *ānandāyai* - // *madhye manonmanyai* // *aiṃ parāyai* - | *aparāyai* - | *parāparāyai* - || *hsauṃ* **sadāśivamahāpretapadmāsanāya namaḥ** / *parameśvaparyaṅkāya namaḥ* // *iti pīṭhaṃ nyasya tatraiva hṛdaye śrībālāṃ dhyāyet* //. There is the same incorporation of the three goddesses before Sadāśiva in the cult of Tripurabhairavī; see PrapañcS 9.13-14; PrapañcSV 130[4-5].

(83) See Sanderson 1986, 178-194.

(84) JñānārṇT 2. 65c-67b: *pañcāśadvarṇarūpām ca kaparda* (Ed. *kandarpa-*) *-śaśibhūṣaṇām // śuddhasphaṭikasaṃkāśām śuddhakṣaumavirājitām / muktāvajrasphuradbhūṣ-ām japamālām kamaṇḍalum // pustakaṃ varadānam ca bibhratīṃ parameśvarīm / evaṃ dhyātvā...*

seed-syllables of Mātṛkā and Parā. That of the former is *hsauḥ*,[85] *hsauṃ*,[86] or *hṣauṃ*.[87] That of the latter is *sauḥ*.[88]

5. THE ICON OF PARĀ AND THE TRIKA'S SELF-PERCEPTION

5. The Trika sees itself as the highest level within the Śaiva revelation : below it are the Bhairava cults of the Southern Stream; below these is the common or exoteric Śaiva system known as the Siddhānta; below the Siddhānta are the various Pāśupata systems (Lākula, Vaimala, Mausula and Kāruka); below Śaivism is the Vaiṣṇava Tantric system of the Pañcarātra; and finally there is the universal prescription *(sāmānyo dharmaḥ)* of the *smārta* and *śrauta* traditions. Thus the Trika locates itself at the furthest remove from neutral, 'vedic' orthodoxy. It might be somewhat surprising therefore that its highest deity should be an ectype of Sarasvatī, the exoteric, nonsectarian consort of Brahmā. The goddesses of the Krama, the Trika's rival for the position of ultimate esoteric revelation, could not be more different in this respect. Their transcendence of the common Hindu religion is vividly revealed in fearsome images of Kāpālika non-duality. How the appearance of Parā was read within the Kashmirian Trika is uncertain, since there is no explicit analysis of her icon in its surviving literature. However, the theory of scriptural revelation expounded in the works of Abhinavagupta suggests that the nonsectarian neutrality of her image would have been understood to express the doctrine that the Trika encapsulates the universal essence of the divine Word *(vāk)*. Parā would then be seen as the embodiment of revelation *(āgamaḥ)* in its entirety, both the Tantric and the Vedic.[89] Thus while the icons of the Krama do

---

(85) See, e.g., the *mantra* of Mātṛkāsarasvatī at AgnikPaddh ff. 70v15 - 71r1: *hsauḥ aṃ āṃ iṃ uṃ ūṃ .....śaṃ ṣaṃ saṃ haṃ ḷaṃ hsauḥ sarasvatyai namaḥ;* and JñānārṇT 3. 16cd, which places this syllable in the centre of the central triangle of the alphabet-*yantra* of Bālā.

(86) See, e.g., KarmK 4, 222[15]; ŚVidyārṇT 83b32 (*re* Śrīkaṇṭhādimātṛkā).

(87) See ĪśānŚGDPaddh KP 6, p. 61[12].

(88) See, e.g., TĀ 30. 27ab. The *Triśirobhairavatantra* adds variants, of which one, *hsauḥ*, is identical with one of the forms of the Mātṛkā seed-syllable; see ibid. 28cd and commentary. Note also the mantra of Parāśakti given in the Kaula system of Devīrah: *oṃ śrīṃ hrīṃ klīṃ sauḥ hsauḥ parāśaktyai aiṃ svāhā* (2. 68c - 69b).

(89) She may be compared here with Paraniṣkaladevī, the goddess of *oṃ*, the pan-Hindu seed-syllable. She is white and two-armed like Parā, but has only one hand-attribute: the consciousness-gesture. See ŚVidyārṇT 121a33 - b3: *atha vakṣye maheśāni paraniṣkaladevatām / yasyāḥ smaraṇamātreṇa cidānandāyate tanuḥ // anugrahādir[= o] deveśi bindunādakalātmakaḥ [+ m] / paraniṣkaladevīyaṃ parabrahmasvarūpiṇī // śuklāmbaraparidhānā śuklamālyānulepanā / jñānamudrāṅkitā yogipatiūrndena sevitā //.*

---

nothing to contradict the orthodox perception of the outer reaches of the Tantric tradition, that of the Trika's Parā responds to this perception by boldly appropriating the orthodox symbolism of the revealed Word, extending it to cover both the Tantric and the Vedic, and assigning the latter, the scriptural tradition which is the origin of this symbolism, to the Word's lowest, most exoteric level.

6. PARĀPARĀ AND APARĀ

6.1. The icons of Parāparā and Aparā, however, have no such symbolic power. In keeping with the norms of the early *śākta* Śaiva tradition of which the Trika is part they have an essentially Kāpālika character. Evidence for these icons, unfortunately, is less complete than for that of Parā. Our fullest visualizations are found in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. There Parāparā is described as follows :[90]

> [Red] as blazing fire, wearing a garland of skulls, with three glowing eyes[91], she sits with trident and skull-staff in her hands on [the shoulders of Sadāśiva,] the 'Great Transcended'.[92] Her tongue flickers in and out like lightning. She is gross-bodied and adorned with great serpents. Her mouth yawns wide and at its corners are terrible fangs. Ferocious, with her brows knitted in rage, wearing a sacred thread in the form of a huge snake, adorned with a string of human corpses round her neck, with the [severed] hands of a human corpse for lotuses to deck her ears, her voice like the thunder of the clouds at the world's end, she seems to swallow space itself.

Aparā is said to have exactly the same appearance, except that she is red-black *(kṛṣṇapiṅgalā)* in colour rather than red.[93]

6.2. The *Tantrasadbhāva* too has visualization texts for these more sinister, subordinate goddesses. That for Parāparā is related textually to the *dhyāna* just quoted from the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. It contains a number of the same quarter and half verses. However,

---

(90) SiYogM 6.20 - 24b: *[dakṣiṇe tatra śūlāgre nyased devīṃ parāparām* (see above n. 68) */] aṣṭatriṃśāṃs(ās) tathā varṇān(ṃ) jvalatpāvakasaṃnibhām // 20 // kapālamālābharaṇāṃ netratritayabhāsurām / saśūlakhaṭvāṅgadharām mahāpretakṛtāsanām // 21 // vidyujjihvā <ṃ >mahākāyāṃ mahāsarpavibhūṣitām / vikarālāṃ mahādaṃṣṭrāṃ mahogrāṃ bhṛkuṭekṣaṇām // 22 // mahāpannaga(na)saṃvitāṃ(?pīḍāṃ) śavamālāvibhūṣitām / mahāśavakarāmbhoja(gaṃ)cārukarṇāvataṃsakām // 23 // pralayāmbudanirghoṣāṃ <?saṃ >-grasantim ivāmbaram /.*

(91) Literally 'shining with three eyes.'

(92) See Sanderson 1986, 179-180 concerning TĀ 15.309-312.

(93) SiYogM 6. 25-26b: *śūlāgre vinyased vāme tryakṣarā <ṃ > [i.e. aparāṃ] paramā-<ṃ >punaḥ / ... // 25 // parāparoktarūpeṇa(na) vidyai(e)ṣā kṛṣṇapiṅgalā(āt) /.*

it mentions neither the goddess's colour nor the attributes of her
hands. There are also crucial differences and additional details. She
is to be visualized in the Ardhanārīśvara form, that is, as the left
half of a composite body whose right half is her consort Bhairava.
She is eight-armed, laughs wildly, intoxicated with wine; and
scorpions are added to the snakes which adorn her.[94] She shares this
last feature with Aghora in his eighteen-armed form as Svacchan-
dabhairava.[95]

The same text describes Aparā as seated in the lap of the
alphabet deity Śabdarāśibhairava in the centre of a red three-spoked
wheel. She laughs intoxicated, her eyes rolling with drunkenness.[96]

6.3. The *Piṅgalāmata*, which, as I have indicated above, gives
instructions for the painting of all three goddesses as a group, says
only that while Parā should be white, Parāparā should be black and
Aparā yellow; and that both, like Parā, should be three-faced, carry
the trident, and be enthroned on lotuses.[97] Their three-facedness
may derive from the Trika's *Triśirobhairavatantra;*[98] but the unusual
colours attributed to the subsidiary pair do not. For that the
Triśirobhairava agrees with the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* in making
Parāparā red and Aparā red-black can be inferred from a section
of that Tantra summarized by Abhinavagupta in his *Tantrāloka,*
when he teaches its version of the *maṇḍala* of the trident-and-lotuses
(triśūlābjamaṇḍalam). We are not told the colours of the goddesses
enthroned upon it; but we do learn that the three lotuses upon the
trident's cusps, which serve as the seats of the goddesses, are (i) red
and eight-petalled, (ii) red-black and three-petalled, and (iii) white and

twelve-petaled. These are evidently the thrones of Parāparā, Aparā
and Parā respectively, since the number of petals prescribed for each
lotus is that of the these goddesses' attendant Yoginīs.[99] Since the
colours of the lotus-thrones of the three goddesses are exactly those
assigned to the goddesses themselves by the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata,*
it is virtually certain that the *Triśirobhairava's* goddesses were of the
same colours.

6.4. South Indian Tantric sources, though generous with information
concerning Parā, are almost entirely silent on the icons of these two
secondary goddesses. Research in this area is far from complete :
there are various works preserved in southern manuscript collec-
tions which will doubtless add to our knowledge of this and related
systems of esoteric Śaiva worship. So far, however, I am aware of
only one description of Parāparā and Aparā in the literature of the
Tamil-speaking region; and this deviates from the āgamic icons to
such an extent and in such a manner that we are bound to conclude
that the original, strongly Kāpālika icons of these two goddesses,
were suppressed or little known, and that the present description
exploits this lacuna for the text's own and quite local sectarian
purpose. The passage occurs in the *Lalitopākhyāna* of the south
Indian *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa.* Its concern is the glorification of
Kāmākṣī, the goddess Lalitā (Tripurasundarī) in the south Indian
city of Kāñcī (Kāñcīpuram), and the focal point of the south Indian
cult of that important goddess :[100]

---

(94) TanSadbh f. 44v3 · (4. 15 - 20b): *ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi vidyā<ṃ> caiva*
parāparām / *ekavīravi(?. pra)dhānena bhairavardhaśarīragam // 15 // karṇika(a)sthāṃ smared
devīṃ catvāriṃśākṣara<ṃ> śubhām / patrāṣṭake tv aghoryādyāḥ padabhede yajet priye // 16
// prahasantī<ṃ> madonmattā<ṃ> daṃṣṭrotkaṭabhayānakā<ṃ> / vikarālāṃ mahābhīmāṃ
śavamālāvibhūṣitām // 17 // gonāsair vṛścikaiś caiva sarpair ābharaṇais tathā / mahāśava-
karāmbhojacārukarṇāvataṃsakām // 18 // pralayāmbudanirghoṣām aṣṭahastāṃ subhīṣaṇām /
tryakṣāṃ ca mahādaṃṣṭrām udgirantīm ivānalam // 19 // icchārūpadharāṃ devīṃ praṇatā-
rtivināśinī<ṃ> /.*

(95) SvT 2. 90ab: *vṛścikair agnivarṇābhair hāreṇa tu virājitam /*

(96) TanSadbh 4. 1c - 5b: *aparāyā varārohe sādhana<ṃ>yad vyavasthitam // 1 //
tryarake tu tataś cakre nābhinemisamanvite / javākusumasaṃkāśe dāḍimīkusumārciṣi // 2 //
tatrasthaṃ pūjayed devaṃ sarvavarṇadharaṃ* [i.e. *śabdarāśibhairavam*] *haram / ta-
duutsa(ccha)ṅgagatāṃ devīṃ tri(tr)varṇām* **aparā**<ṃ> *śubhām //3// prahasantīṃ(n) ma-
donmattāṃ(aṃ) madavibhrāntalocanā<ṃ> / taḍitsahasrasaṃkāśāṃ sarvālaṅkārabhūṣitām //
4 // itthaṃrūpeṇa sā devī pūjanīyā samāhinā /.*

(97) PiṅgM 5.18: *parā...... sarve śuklāḥ;* 5.21-23c: *aparā...... sarve pītāḥ;* 5.25c-26a:
parāparā ...... kṛṣṇāḥ smṛtā hy etāḥ ./. This passage lists the Tantric deities according to the
colours in which they must be painted. See also PiṅgM 5.37c - 38b quoted above, n. 48..

(98) See above, p. 00.

(99) TĀ 31.115: *kajatrayaṃ tu śūlāgre(aṃ) vedāṃśair dvādaśāṅgulam / kramād
dakṣānyamadhyeṣu tryaṣṭadvādaśapatrakam //,* 'three lotuses on the cusps of the trident [with
a radius] of twelve finger-breadths across their four segments, on the right, the left, and in
the centre, with three, eight, and twelve petals respectively'. 118cd: *raktaṃ raktāsitaṃ śuklaṃ
kramād ūrdhvāmbujatrayam //,* 'the three upper lotuses are red, red-black, and white respec-
tively.' The eight Yoginīs forming the retinue of Parāparā are Aghorā, Paramaghorā,
Ghorarūpā, Ghoramukhī, Bhīmā, Bhīṣaṇā, Vamanī and Pibanī (the deities of the eight parts
[*padāni*] of her *mantra* [see above n. 73]); see TĀV 12 (33) 341[10·13] quoting *Triśirobhairava.* The
three Yoginīs of Aparā (embodied as the three syllables of her *vidyā*) are Mānasī, Cakravegā
and Mohanī; see SiYogM f. 34v; TanSadbh f. 43r-v. The twelve of Parā (embodied as twelve
transformations of *sauḥ* arising through the substitution for -*auḥ* of the twelve vowels *(a, ā,
i, ī u, ū, e, ai, o, au, aṃ, aḥ)* are Siddhi, Ṛddhi, Lakṣmī, Dīpti, Mālā, Śivāśivā, Sumukhī,
Vāmanī, Nandā, Harikeśī, Hayānanā and Viśveśī; see MālVijUT 20.46-47.

(100) BrahmāP (Lalitop) 39.9-14b: *ādyā* **yānuttarā**(*yānutarā*) *sā syāc citparā tv
ādikāraṇam / anākhyeti*(*antākhyeti*) *tathā proktā svarūpa(svarūpāt)tattvacintakaiḥ // 9 //
dvitīyābhūt tataḥ śuddhaparā dvibhujasaṃyutā / dakṣahaste yogamudrāṃ vāmahaste tu
pustakam // 10 // .bibhratī himakundendumuktāsamavapurdyutiḥ / parāparā tṛtīyā syād
bālārkāyutasammitā // 11 // sarvābharaṇasaṃyuktā dakṣa(śa)hastadhṛtāmbujā / vāmorunyasta-
hastā ca(vā) kirīṭārdhendubhūṣaṇā // 12 // paścāc caturbhujā jātā sāparā [=sā aparā]
tripurāruṇā / pāśāṅkuśekṣukodaṇḍapañcabāṇalasatkarā // 13 // lalitā saiva* **kāmākṣī** *kāñcyāṃ
vyaktim upāgatā /.*

The primordial [Goddess] than whom nothing is greater is Parā-as
Consciousness, the First Cause. Those who contemplate the nature of the Self
also call her the Nameless (Anākhyā). She is the source of Parā proper, the
second [Power]. This Parā is two-armed. She shows the yoga-gesture with her
right hand and holds a manuscript in the other. Her body shines [white] as
snow, jasmine, the moon, and pearls. Third is Parāparā. Red with the radiance
of a myriad of rising suns she is decked out with every variety of adornment.
She holds a lotus in her right hand and rests her left hand upon her thigh.
She wears a crown and the new moon upon it. After her came Aparā. This
is the red, four-armed Tripurā. She carries a noose, a goad, a sugar-cane bow
and [a set of] five arrows. It is this same goddess Lalitā that has manifested
herself in Kāñcī as Kāmākṣī.

These verses tell us more about the relationship between the
Trika and the cult of Kāmākṣī/Lalitā than about the Trika itself.
They seek to universalize the cult by fitting it into the Trika's
triadic-tetradic schema of the three goddesses and their transcen-
dental unity. What is remarkable is the position assigned to Lalitā
herself. In spite of the fact that she is the true focus of the cult, and
although it is her glorification that is the principal purpose of this
text, no more is claimed for her than that she take the place of
Aparā, the lowest of the three goddesses. At the same time, however,
she is made to harness the full power and prestige of the Trika. For
we can see from the eighth *khaṇḍa* of the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*
that the worship of Parā, following the Anuttara system based on
the exegesis of the *Parātriṃśikā,* was incorporated within the cycle
of her worship : Parā became the 'heart' of Lalitā. So the rela-
tionship was not necessarily conceived as one of subordination :
Kāmākṣī / Lalitā could be seen as incorporating the whole of the
Trika pantheon in such a way that the four-armed manifestation on
the surface of the cult was only one level of her identity, Parā, her
heart, being seen as a higher form of Kāmākṣī herself. Also local
is the red, two-armed goddess holding a lotus in her right hand, who
is placed between the two as the Parāparā of this scheme. She is
evidently the goddess Ādilakṣmī, who is said in the *Lalitopākhyāna*
to dwell in the cave *(bilākāśaḥ, guhākāśaḥ)* which is the heart of the
Kāmākṣī temple (40.103-107). What we have, then, is not simply
a case of the Trika colonizing and subordinating a local cult, but a
case of a local cult incorporating the Trika and superimposing the
identity of its goddesses upon the Trika's āgamic pantheon. We see
the same process at Cidambaram, probably the most important of
all south Indian Śaiva centres. The famous Śiva Lord of Dancers
(Naṭarāja) enshrined there is made the symbol of the Trika's
dynamic Absolute in the *Parātriṃśikātātparyadīpikā,* [101] the

---

(101) See above, p. 00.

Mahārthamañjarīparimala of Maheśvarānanda (here in the context
of the Krama),[102] and the *Ānandatāṇḍavavilāsastotra* of the latter's
guru Mahāprakāśa.[103] The same projection has occurred in the
variant of the Kubjikā cult known as the [Ṣaḍanvaya] Śāmbhava.[104]

7. SCRIPTURAL AND POSTSCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION OF THE THREE ICONS

7.1. The *Mālinīvijayottaratantra,* the scripture expounded in Abhina-
vagupta's *Tantrāloka,* describes Parāparā and Aparā only in the
barest outline. Following the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and echoing
some of its wording it makes them red and red-black respectively.
However, it also distinguishes them with regard to the sentiments
which they embody. Aparā, it says, is terrifying *(bhīṣaṇā)*, the
opposite of the gentle, nourishing Parā, while Parāparā is half-way
between these extremes, being "not terrifying, yet somewhat fero-
cious *(kiṃcidugrā na bhīṣaṇā)."* [105] This accords with the doctrine
that the three goddesses are the sources and archetypes of the three
great divisions of the Mothers *(mātaraḥ),* namely the Mild *(aghorāḥ,
śāntāḥ),* the Terrible *(ghorāḥ),* and the Utterly Terrible *(ghoratarāḥ,
ghoraghoratarāḥ)* [106] These three divisions, which, in the exorcistic
context of the Trika's cult of Yoginīs, are subdivided into various
classes of female spirits,[107] are presented by the *Mālinīvijayottara* in

---

(102) See MahārthMP p. 194[25-26]. The same is perhaps implied at 188[22-23] in which
Bhairava (189[16]: Svacchandabhairava) is said to be in a jewelled pavilion in the *saṃvidākāśaḥ.*
The latter and *cidambaram* (/Cidambaram) are synonyms.

(103) Quoted at MahārthMP 159[26] - 160[2].

(104) See the verse for Paraśambhunātha in the *raśmimālā,* a sequence of *mantras* used
in the dawn *japa* of the Lalitā cult: *pūrṇāhantāsvarūpāya tasmai paramaśambhave /
ānandatāṇḍavoddaṇḍapaṇḍitāya namo namaḥ //* (Nityots 132[13-14]). The *mantra: aiṃ hrīṃ śrīṃ
hskhphreṃ hsauḥ aham ahaṃ hsauḥ hskhphreṃ śrīṃ hrīṃ aiṃ* (Nityots 126[8-9]). In this system
Śiva as Navātman / Navakeśvara is visualized dancing as he embraces his consort Samayā
Kubjikā; see, e.g., ŚambhNirṇ 3.10: *(mūrtih) navīnavārīdākārā nṛtyantī yauvanānvitā /;* Ni-
tyāhnTil folio 26r: *nīlaḥ pañcānano nṛtyann ūrdhvaparyaṅkasaṃsthitaḥ / dvirasṭavarṣadeśīyo
... navaḥ //.* This icon is illustrated in Rawson (1978: 19); see above, n. 38.

(105) MālVijUT 8. 72b-74b: *dakṣiṇottarayor dvayam / parāparāṃ svarūpeṇa rakta-
varṇāṃ mahābalām // 72 // icchārūpadharāṃ dhyātvā kiṃcidugrāṃ na bhīṣaṇān / aparāṃ
vāmaśṛṅge tu bhīṣaṇāṃ kṛṣṇapiṅgalām // 73 // icchārūpadharāṃ devīṃ praṇatārtivināśinām /.*

(106) MālVijUT 3. 30-33; TĀ 3. 71c-75c (concerning Parā and Parāparā); JayadYāmT
saṭka 1, *paṭala* 26 *(śuleśvarīvidhiḥ),* 36-38b: *cakrāṇāṃ trisvarūpāṇāṃ śāntaghorātighorīnāṃ /
yonayaḥ kīrtitā hy e<tāḥ>... // 36 // ābhiḥ saṃpūjitābhis tu siddhābhis trisvarūpa(i)kam /
viśvam yad(saṃ) yoginījālaṃ śāntaghoravimiśrakam // 37 // vaśam āyāty asaṃdehāt setsyante
sarvasiddhayaḥ /.* Hence at JayadYāmT *saṭka* 4, folio 190r2 *(bhairavānanāvidhau bhūmikāvid-
hipaṭalaḥ,* verse 61ab) the three goddesses are termed Aghorā, Ghorā and Ghoraghoratarā:
aghorā ghorarūpā ca ghora(ā)ghoratarātmikā /. The same equation is seen at RahPañc 12.

(107) See the Yoginī-taxonomy of *Yoginījālaśaṃvaratantra* (one of the *Śaktitantras* of
the *Vidyāpīṭha* division of the *Bhairava* canon) which is given in the *Yoginīsaṃcāra[-prakaraṇ-
am]* of the *Jayadrathayāmalatantra* (3, folio 172r5 - v4 *[yoginīcakreśvarotpattipaṭala* verses

more abstract terms. The three classes of Śiva's Powers *(śivaśak-tayaḥ)*, as it calls them, are defined as (i) those which liberate souls *(aghorāḥ / parāḥ)*, (ii) those which hold souls where they are, preventing them from progressing towards liberation by causing them to cling to the fruits of their actions *(ghorāḥ / parāparāḥ)*, and (iii) those which immerse souls in sensuality, drawing them down-wards to ever lower levels of existence *(ghoratarāḥ / aparāḥ)*.[108]

7.2. In the *Jayadrathayāmala* and in the exegesis of Abhinavagupta this abstraction is developed further. In the former Parā, Parāparā and Aparā are equated with Śiva's great powers of *icchā, jñānam* and *kriyā*, that is, with (i) the prediscursive impulse which precedes all cognition and action, (ii) cognition, and (iii) action, and also with Śiva, his Power (Śakti) and individualized consciousness *(naraḥ, aṇuḥ)*,[109] the triad whose non-duality is the central doctrine of the Kashmirian Trika.[110] The latter records yet other metaphysical triads as the real nature of the goddesses : (i) emission *(sṛṣṭiḥ)*, maintenance of the emitted *(sthitiḥ)*, and its resorption *(saṃhāraḥ)*; (ii) the agent of cognition *(pramātā)*, the medium of cognition *(pramāṇam)*, and the object of cognition *(prameyam)*; (iii) non-duality *(abhedaḥ / advaitam)*, duality-cum-non-duality *(bhedābhedaḥ / dvaitādvaitam)*, and duality *(bhedaḥ / dvaitam)*.[111]

7.3. Of these equations the most resonant in the system is certainly that in which Parā is identified with the cosmic process of emission or creation. For this links the concrete qualities of the goddess as the nectar effusing invigorator of life and knowledge with the abstract categories of non-duality and cognitive agency (subjectivity *[pramātṛtā]*). The quality of invigoration *(āpyāyanam)* contemplated in her *sādhana*s is easily translated into the concept of emission when this is understood as the inexhaustible creative power of an

autonomous *(svatantrā)*, unseconded *(advitīyā)* consciousness *(saṃvit, cit)* which must project all reality within itself; and the categories of non-duality and the subject or agent of cognition *(pramātā)* are generally presented from the same point of view : as the basis or source of appearance in consciousness rather than as that which remains when this appearance has been dissolved. The Supreme Power *(parā śaktiḥ)* is certainly both projector and resor-ber of phenomena in Abinavagupta's non-dualism; but his exposition of the Trika as a system of encoded ritual and meditation is definitely and explicitly weighted towards an emanationist rather than a resorptionist representation of this dynamic non-duality. He reveals this inflection in the following cryptic analysis of the meaning of Parā's seed-syllable *sauḥ*:[112]

> This real [world] *(sat* [= *s*]), which begins from [the Sphere *(aṇḍam)* of] Brahmā and is referred to [in the *Mālinīvijayottara*[113]] as the Sphere of Matter *(māyāṇḍam)* derives its reality from the fact that it traverses [the 'trident' (= *-au-*) of the three powers of] precognitive impulse *(icchā)*, cognition and action. For it is only by traversing these three powers that it is projected into *(visṛjyate* [= *-ḥ (visarga)*]) [, i.e. comes to rest in] the consciousness of Bhairava. Or rather it is only by this means that it is projected out from that [innermost consciousness]. Thus the fact that these [Spheres, of Brahmā, *prakṛtiḥ* and *māyā*] are real [*s-*] entails that they are identical with those three powers [*-au-*], that they are the projection [*-ḥ*] [of the ultimate consciousness] and are of the essence of that consciousness.

The commentator Jayaratha points out that in this passage Abhinavagupta is reading *sauḥ* from both perspectives : both from that of resorption *(saṃhārakramaḥ)* and from that of emission *(sṛṣṭikramaḥ)*. Abhinavagupta gives two meanings to the projection expressed by the *-ḥ* element of the seed-syllable, so that *sauḥ* is made to express both (i) [the awareness of] the projection of the universe *into* consciousness, the fact that it comes to rest *(viśrāntiḥ)*, through resorption, within the non-duality of the transcendental subject

---

71c - 82]). See also *paṭala* 15 of the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāva*, parts of which are cited in an exorcistic context by Kṣemarāja commenting on the *Netratantra*; see NeTU 2 (19) 145$^{3\cdot20}$ and 146$^{1\cdot5,7}$ [Emendations: for *dūṣikā, nakradūṣī, dūṣate*, and *dūṣikā* read *cūṣikā, nakrucūṣī* etc.; for *āsādya* read *ācchādya*, for *patralekhī* read *patralehī*].

(108) MālVijUT 3. 30-33;

(109) JayadYāmT 4, folio 190r1-3 *(bhairavānanāvidhau bhūmikāvidhipaṭalaḥ* verses 59b-62b): *parā caivāparā caiva satta(ntā) caiva parāparā // 59 // triskandhā sā tridhāmasthā icchājñānakriyātmikā / vāmā jyeṣṭhā tathā raudrā triśīrṣā triśirotthitā // 60 // aghorā ghorarūpā ca ghora(ā)ghoratarātmikā / śāntā ghorā tathā raudrā bhavā caivābhavā tathā // 61 // tathā hy atibhavā devī naraśaktiśivātmikā /.*

(110) See, e.g., TĀV 7 (10) 124$^{7\cdot8}$; PTViv 187 verse 3 (2$^{5\cdot8}$); PTTātD 12c-16c.

(111) See TĀ 1.2; 5.23c-25b; 33.30 (reading *parā parāparā* rather than the edition's *parāparā parā*); TSāra 28$^{7\cdot13}$; RahPañc 13. For the equation with *icchā* etc. see, e.g., Bodhpañc 15.

---

(112) TĀ 4. 186b-89b: *tathā hi sad idaṃ brahmamūlaṃ māyāṇḍasaṃjñitam // 186 // icchājñānakriyāroham vinā naiva sad ucyate / tacchaktitritayārohād bhairavīye cidātmani // 187 // visṛjyate hi tat tasmād bahir vātha visṛjyate / evaṃ sadrūpataivaiṣāṃ satāṃ śakti-trayātmatām // 188 // visargaṃ parabodhena samākṣipyaiva vartate /.*

(113) MālVijUT 2. 49: *pārthivaṃ prākṛtaṃ caiva māyīyaṃ śāktam eva ca / iti saṃkṣ-epataḥ proktam etad aṇḍacatuṣṭayam //.* The 'sphere of earth' *(pārthivam aṇḍam)* is the sphere (or 'egg') of Brahmā *(brahmaṇḍam)* which occupies the lowest *tattva (pṛthivītattvam)*. The *prākṛtam aṇḍam* is that and everything up to and including *prakṛtiḥ*, the twenty-fourth *tattva* (the ultimate non-spiritual substance or primal matter of the Sāṃkhyas). The *māyīyam aṇḍam (Māyāṇḍam)*, i.e. the Sphere of Māyā, is these and everything else up to an including *māyā*, the thirty-first *tattva* and the material cause of all saṃsāric manifestation. All this and the pure *tattvas* up the thirty-fifth *(śaktitattvam)* are the *śāktam aṇḍam*. Beyond these is Śiva, the thirty-sixth and final *tattva*. See also ParamSāra 4 and commentary.

(parapramātā, akalpitapramātā), and (ii) [the awareness of] its projection *out of* that non-duality, its emission into consciousness from within.[114] Nonetheless, Jayaratha explains, Abhinavagupta intends the mode of emission to be understood as the basic sense of the syllable. For the *Tantrāloka* speaks of *sauḥ* as the 'heart in emission' *(sṛṣṭau hṛt [= sṛṣṭihṛdayam])*, contrasting it with *khphreṃ*, the 'heart in resorption' *(saṃhārahṛdayam)*.[115] It analyses both syllables in such a way that each expresses reality both in the mode of emission and in the mode of resorption; but in *sauḥ* it is the former which is essential and predominant, and in *khphreṃ* it is the latter.[116] Thus Abhinavagupta's interpretation of *sauḥ* is in keeping with the aesthetics of creation, creativity and invigoration encoded in Parā's āgamic icons and *sādhanas*; and it is so in spite of a general tendency in his exegesis to assimilate the understanding of the Trika into the doctrines of the Krama with their emphatically resorptionist orientation.

8. KĀLASAṂKARṢIṆĪ, THE FOURTH GODDESS

8.1.1. I have shown elsewhere certain aspects of this influence of the Krama on the Trika in Kashmir, notably Abhinavagupta's inter-

---

(114) TĀV 3 (4) 217[14]-218[5] : *parapramātrātmani bhaivarīye rūpe visṛjyate tatra viśrāntiṃ yāyād iti saṃhārakramaḥ / atha vā sṛṣṭikrameṇa tasmād bhairavīyād rūpāt tad viśvam bahir visṛjyate śaktisopānāvarohakrameṇa kalādikṣitiparyantena sthūlena rūpenāvabhāsata ity arthaḥ /.*

(115) TĀ 4. 191cd: *idaṃ saṃhārahṛdayam prācyam sṛṣṭau ca hṛm matam //.* The resorption-seed here is definitely *khphreṃ*. Padoux (1963: 356-358) gives it as *rkhkṣem* (for *rkṣkhem* ?), which goes against TĀ 5. 146 and commentary, where it is *khphreṃ*. However, he does follow Jayaratha, who refers to the letter which is either *kṣa* or *kha* as *kūṭavarṇaḥ* (TĀV 3 [4] 222[4] : *saṃhārakuṇḍalinyātmakasyaitadrūpalipeḥ kūṭavarṇasya ...* 'the *kūṭa* letter, which embodies the Kuṇḍalinī of Resorption, and shows this in the shape of its written form.'). The term *kūṭa-* occurs with reference to the alphabet only in the expression *kūṭabījam* applied to *kṣa*; see TĀV 2 (3) 178[4,11]. Gnoli (1972: 176) takes Abhinavagupta to be referring to *khphreṃ* here and he is certainly right to have done so. However, he does not come to terms with the fact that Jayaratha seems to disagree. I propose that the reading *kūṭavarṇasya* in his commentary is a corruption of *kuṇḍalavarṇasya*. JayadYāmT ṣaṭka 4, folio 200v 2-3 gives *kuṇḍalam* among code-terms for *kṣa* (*kuṇḍalaṃ bhairavaṃ rāvaṃ rāvinī yoginīpriyam / kuṇḍalīnātham atulaṃ krūraṃ vai bhīmam aṅkuśam / phakāraṃ dhāmadhāmānam nāmabhiḥ samudāhṛtam //*) and Jayaratha quotes this same passage on the code-names of *ha* at TĀV 2 (3) 145[5].

(116) TĀ 4. 191cd: *idaṃ saṃhārahṛdayam* [i.e. *khphreṃ*] *prācyam* [i.e. *sauḥ*] *sṛṣṭau ca hṛm matam //.* TĀV 3 (4) 219[15-16] : *śrīparābījasya saṃhārakrameṇodaye 'pi sṛṣṭiprādhānyena darśitam /;* ibid. 223[7,10] : *asya ca śrīparābījavat sṛṣṭikrameṇa sambhavaty apy udaye rephādīnāṃ varṇānāṃ bhedasaṃhārakatvāt tatprādhānyena nirdeśaḥ saṃhārahṛdayam iti /.* See also NityaṣoḍARĀ 248[18] : *śaktibījasvarūpā parā śaktir divyāmṛtakalayā samastaṃ jagad utpādayantī dhyātavyā /;* and *Kulacūḍāmaṇitantra* quoted at ŚivSūVim 58[16] : *ekaṃ sṛṣṭimayaṃ bījam.* That this last passage refers to *sauḥ* is clear from the context of its citation at PTViv 269[6] (242[6]).

---

pretation of the triadic, emission-centred system of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Mālinīvijayottara* in the light of the tetradic Trika of the *Devyāyāmala*[117] in which one worships Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī as a fourth, resorptive goddess above Parā, Parāparā and Aparā.[118] We do not have the *Devyāyāmala*'s visualization of this goddess; but we do have her *mantras* and these lead us to parallel sources from which we can form an idea of the missing icon.

8.1.2. The *mantras* are two, one nine-syllabled *(navākṣarī vidyā)* and the other seventeen-syllabled *(saptadaśākṣarī)*: (i) *khphreṃ mahācaṇḍayogeśvar*[119] and (ii) *hrīṃ mahācaṇḍayogeśvari ṭhṛ dhṛ thṛ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ.*[120] They show that this form of the Trika is an extension of the tradition of Kālī worship propagated in the āgamas of the Krama and in the *Jayadrathayāmalatantra*. The first *mantra*, that of nine syllables, is central to the former;[121] and the second, that of seventeen syllables, is almost identical with the latter's principal *mantra* of Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī (*hrīṃ mahācaṇḍayogeśvari ṭhrīṃ dhrīṃ thrīṃ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ*[122]).

8.1.3. There is nothing in the āgamas of the Krama comparable to the *yāga* of the *Devyāyāmala*: the pantheons of those texts are entirely independent of the Trika. The *Jayadrathayāmala*, on the other hand, contains among its many *yāgas* of Kālī / Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī four which are of the same kind as the *Devyāyāmala*'s, the goddess

---

(117) See Sanderson 1986, 188-204.

(118) See TĀV 2 (3) 82[16-18] and 12 (31) 271[4] quoting the *Devyāyāmala: tanmadhye tu parā devī dakṣiṇe tu parāparā / aparā vāmaśṛṅge tu madhyaśṛṅgordhvataḥ śṛnu // yā sā saṃkarṣiṇī devī parātītā vyavasthitā /;* TĀV 12 (31) 270[16-17] : *parāyā api parā mātṛsadbhāvādiśabdavyapadeśyā kālasaṃkarṣiṇī bhagavaty uktā...*

(119) The *vidyā* is raised at TĀ 30. 45c-46b *(khphreṃ)* + 30. 54-55b *(mahācaṇḍayogeśvar)*.

(120) This *vidyā* is given in the Mālinī code (explained at, e.g., MālVijUT 3. 37-41b) in a passage of the *Devyāyāmala* quoted at TĀV 11 (29) 49[1-13]. For *nāsārṇam* in line 3 read *nāsārṇam.*

(121) It is raised at DevīdvyŚ 85-87 (folio 8v 1-4 [*navavarṇā kuleśvarī*]). KālīkulaKA folios 15v7-16r2 paraphrase this and prescribe the *vidyā* for the worship of each of the five Krama cycles, Emission *(sṛṣṭi-)*, Presence *(sthiti-, avatāra-)*, Resorption *(saṃhāra-)*, the Nameless *(anākhya-)*, and the [Pure] Light *(bhāsa-) (pañcacakrasāmānyā navākṣarī vidyā)*. In both texts a seventeen syllabed form is produced by separating its letters: *kha pha ra eṃ ca na ḍa ya o ga e śa va ri*; see DevīdvyŚ 89ab (folio 9v 4-5): *navavarṇavibhedena jñeyā sā ṣoḍaśādhikā;* and KālīkulaKA folio 15v5. At DevīpañcŚ 3. 35-40 and 4. 63-68 the nine syllabed *vidyā* is raised as the formula of the cycles of emission *(sṛṣṭikramaḥ)* and resorption *(saṃhārakramaḥ)*. It is also given in the Kālīmata tradition of the cult of Tripurasundarī as the *mantra* of the Uttarāmnāya; see JñānārṇT 9. 7-8b. Compare also the seventeen syllabed *vidyā* raised at DevīpañcŚ 5. 57-63 for the worship of the cycle of the Nameless *(anākhyakramaḥ)*: *āṃ khphreṃ phāṃ phiṃ mahācaṇḍayogeśvar phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ*

(122) See JayadYāmT 1.11.32-39.

in each being worshipped above and/or as the unity of Parā, Parāpara and Aparā. These *yāgas* are (i) that of [Tri-]śūleśvarī in the first *ṣaṭka*, and those of (ii) Mahāparā, (iii) Parā-Uttarakālī (/Tricakreśvarī), and (iv) Triśīrṣa (/ Bhairavānanā) in the fourth. Their visualizations are as follows.

Śūleśvarī : [123]

He should trace the trident so that its cusps face east or north. In the centre between the lateral cusps he should draw a square eleven finger breadths by eleven. In a circle centred on the tip of the central cusp * ... * there should be a lotus with eight petals, a 'hub' and sixteen filaments. He should colour as before. On this lotus he should worship the goddess [Śūleśvarī, visualizing her as] adorned with a mass of three-eyed serpents, open-mouthed and fanged, shining with the colour of lamp-black, carrying in her hands a knife, a skull-bowl, a great trident and a skull-staff, richly decked with all manner of adornment, her body white with the ashes [of the cremated], sitting on [the shoulders of] Ananta................ Then, having drawn three * ... * on the cusps he should install upon them the three goddesses [Parā, Parāparā and Aparā].

Mahāparā : [124]

The white goddess Mahāparā (the Great Parā), the supreme Kālasaṃkarṣ-aṇī,[125] three-eyed and single-faced, upon a white lotus, sitting on [the shoulders of] a white [Sadāśiva] Transcended, finely dressed in white garments, four-armed, beautiful, lean-limbed, adorned with serpents, with a serpent as her sacred thread, with serpents as bracelets about her upper arms...

Parā - Uttarakālī : [126]

Eighteen-syllabled, terrible, eager to devour the three worlds, bestowers of all

---

(123) JayadYāmT 1. 26. 18c-23: *prāgagraṃ vartayec chūlaṃ(ṃm) athavottarakaṇṭhakam // 18 // *prākāra* śṛṅgamadhyasthaṃ(h) kṣetra<ṃ> rudrāṅgulaṃ samam / *vandhyāṣṭāṃ* madhyaśṛṅgāgravṛttāspavibhāgagam // 19 // aṣṭapatraṃ sanābhiṃ tu daśaṣaṭkesarākulam // pūrvavat pūrayet tad dhi tatra deviṃ prapūjayet // 20 // karālasarpa(syarpa)cakrena daṃṣṭrino(ā)gratricakṣuṣā / rājitām (rājñitām) añjanābhāsivarṇena ca sphurattviṣa(ā)m // 21 // kartrīkādya(kṛttikāla)mahāśūlakhaṭvāṅgodyatapāṇinīm / sarvabhūṣaṇabhūṣādhyāṃ bhas-mapāṇḍuvapuṣmatīm // 22 // anantāsanam ārūḍhām ... // 31 // atha śṛṅgatraye trīṇi kṛtya cāmīkarāṇi tu / tatra devītraya(aṃ)nyāsaṃ kuryād ...*

(124) JayadYāmT *ṣaṭka* 4, folio 115v1-3: *śuklā<ṃ> mahāparā<ṃ> devī<īṃ> kālasaṃkarṣaṇī<ṃ> parām / trinetrām ekavaktrām ca śvetapadmopari sthitām / śvetapreta-samārūḍhām śvetāmbaravibhūṣitām / caturbhujām suvapuṣām kṛśāṅgīm sarpamaṇḍitām / vyālayajñopavītīṃ ca vyālāṅgadavibhūṣitām /.*

(125) The form -saṃkarṣiṇī is better Sanskrit and used by the commentators. In the āgamas themselves we find -saṃkarṣaṇi.

(126) JayadYāmT *ṣaṭka* 4 folio 136r 2-4 (*parotta<ra>kālīsādhanapaṭalaḥ*, verses 13c-17b): *aṣṭādaśākṣarā ghorā trailokyagrāsaghasmarā // 13 // sarvasiddhikarī raudrā cakra-melāpasiddhidā / *dhyāyohuya* ghanākāśaprakhyā paramabhaivarī // 14 // kṛśāṅgī ghora-vadanā viśvarūpā mahaujasā / mahāpretasamārūḍhā sarvāyudhakarodyatā // 15 // parāparātha*

---

siddhis, fearsome, granter of success in rites to summon the hoardes of celestial Yoginīs, Bhairavī Supreme, [dark] as a sky filled *with rain-laden clouds* (?), lean-limbed, her face terrible to behold, omniform, of vast strength, sitting on [the shoulders of Sadāśiva] the Great Transcended, holding all manner of weapons in her hands. He should visualize Parā, Parāpara and Aparā, and then, *O Umā* (?), this supreme goddess above them. And those [three should be visualized] on [the cusps of a] trident, seated [likewise] on Sadāśivas.

Triśīrṣa (Bhairavānanā) :[127]

She should be visualized black as a crow, as a swarm of bees or the clouds at the world's end, three-faced, awesome, eighteen-armed, roaring horribly as she destoys the universe, mounted emaciated and terrible on [the shoulders of] the Great Transcended with various weapons in her hands, her limbs clad with [a skirt made of] strings of bones, and her hair flowing upwards.

If any one of these four is likely to be akin to the lost icon it is the ash-white Śūleśvarī, carrying the knife and skull-bowl, the trident and the skull-staff. For her *yāga* is taught as one of a basic set of five through which one may be initiated into the cult of the seventeen-syllabled *mantra* of Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī.[128] This *mantra*, as we have seen, is virtually identical with the *mantra* of Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī taught in the *Devyāyāmala*. The *mantras* of the other three Kālasaṃkarṣiṇīs are quite unrelated to it. That of Mahāparā is the seed-syllable *jhphrūm*.[129] Parā-Uttarakālī's is *rhrīṃ pare parāpare apare tricakreśvari hraḥ phaṭ phaṭ*.[130] That of Triśīrṣa / Bhairavānanā is *svāṃ hrīṃ svāmini jaya vidyeśvari cakreśvari bhairavānane hrīṃ svāṃ phaṭ phaṭ phaṭ*.[131]

8.2. Ekāntavāsinī (/ Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī)

This identification gains some support from an unexpected source, the practical handbooks for the non-Tantric, domestic

---

vā śuddhā hy aparātha parātha vā / evaṃ dhyāyed devadeviṃ tāsāṃ pṛṣṭhe sthitām ume(?.ama) // 16 // tāś ca śūlasthitā devyo mahāpretakṛtāsanāḥ(ā) / The name Uttarakālī is given by the JayadYāmMUddh, folio 61v 7; and I have restored the colophon of the chapter (*parotta<ra>kālīsādhana-*) accordingly.

(127) JayadYāmT *ṣaṭka* 4, folio 198r 1-2 (*bhairavavyāptividhipaṭ°*, vv. 46c-48): *kṛṣṇā<ṃ> kākalinīhārakālamegha(tha)samadyutim // 46 // trivaktrām saṃ(sā)smared raudrām aṣṭādaśabhujānvitām / sukṛśāṃ bhīmanirhrādahrādinīṃ viśvaghaṭṭanim // 47 // mahāpretakṛ-tāvasthām nānāpraharaṇodyatām / halamālāvanaddhāṅgīm ūrdhvakeśām bhayānakām // 48 //.*

(128) The first and basic *ṣaṭka* of the JayadYāmT teaches a primary *yāga* of the seventeen-syllabled *mantra* (*paṭ°* 15 [+ 11 (*kālasaṃkarṣaṇīvidyoddhāraḥ*)]), and four alter-natives : the *yāgas* of (i) Bhairava or Bhairavī and six Yoginīs (*paṭ°* 19), (ii) Lakṣmībhaṭṭā-rikā and sixteen Kālis (*paṭ°* 21), (iii) Śūleśvarī and the three goddesses Parā, Parāparā and Aparā (*paṭ°* 26), and (iv) Vajreśvarī (*paṭ°* 28).

(129) Raised at JY 4, *ṣaṭka* 4, folios 115v7-116r1.

(130) Raised ibid., folios 135v6-136r2.

(131) Raised ibid., folio 188r 3-7.

(gṛhya-) rituals of the Kashmirian brahmins; for an icon of Kālasaṃ-karṣiṇī similar to that of Śūleśvarī has made its way into these rituals from the Tantric tradition. The presentation of offerings to series of mother-goddesses *(mātṛkāpūjā)* represented by idols, paintings, or small heaps of unhusked barley is standard in *smārta* Vedic ritual, being a constituent preliminary of the presentation of offerings to the Rejoicing Ancestor-deities *(nāndīmukhaśrāddham)* which is itself a constituent preliminary of all such auspicious ceremonies as those of birth, investiture, marriage and the consecration of homes *(veśmapratiṣṭhā),* temples and idols *(pratiṣṭhā);*[132] but in Kashmir this exoteric goddess-worship has been moulded to reflect the prestigious Tantric cults that flourished in this region. The mothers, who are usually just a linear series, are worshipped here in Tantric fashion as the emanations or retinue of a central goddess. In the standard handbooks for these domestic rituals this central goddess is termed Ekāntavāsinī ('She-who-dwells-in-solitude') without further information;[133] but a versified account of the cult found in a birch-bark *Kāśmīrikakarmakāṇḍapaddhati* identifies Ekāntavāsinī as the goddess Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī.[134] It also gives a *dhyāna :*[135]

> One should visualize her seated on a lotus, one-faced, eight-armed, three-eyed and richly adorned, displaying in her hands a skull-bowl and skull-staff, a

(132) See DhKoś 3, III, pp. 1695-1707 for this *smārta mātṛkāpūjā.*

(133) See VivV 1-2 *(kanyāsaṃskāravidhiḥ)* and VedKalpD 136 *(veśmapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ).* According to these texts of the Kashmirian tradition the mothers are grouped into five sets of seven and one pair: (i) Brāhmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Nārasiṃhī and Aindrī; (ii) Gaurī, Padmā, Śacī, Medhā, Sāvitrī, Vijayā and Jayā; (iii) Devasenā, Svadhā, Svāhā, the Mātṛs, the Lokamātṛs, Dhṛti and Tuṣṭi; (iv) Puṣṭi and Ātmadevatā; (v) Lalitā, Umā, Gaurī, Ambikā, Salilāśrayā, Bhagāhī and Bhagākṣī; and (vi) Anumati, Rākā, Sinīvalī, Kuhū, Dhātrī, Sarveśvarī and Anneśvarī. These are worshipped in (i) seven walnuts, (ii) seven vertical lines of melted butter (= the *vasor dhārāḥ,* poured down the surface of a low wall [see DhKoś 3, III, 1708-1710]); (iii) a coloured and spotted veil (worn by women on festive occasions [Kashm. *ṭĕk' - pūč;* see Grierson 1049a (under *ṭyok*)], (iv) oneself, (v) the branches of the representation of the wishing-tree *(kalpavṛkṣaḥ)* plastered on the wall [Kashm. *diwaṭa - mūn;* see Grierson 265a (under *diwath*)], and (vi) seven balls of cooked rice [Kashm. *diwaṭa - gūl;* see ibid.]. Ekāntavāsinī is worshipped in the midst of these in an earthenware pot filled with water, fruit etc. [Kashm. *diwaċa - wör;* see ibid.]. See VedKalpD 136. An outline drawing of this arrangement can be seen at KarmK 4, iii and xxiii. Outside Kashmir the norm is to worship Gaṇeśa + the mothers in groups (ii) to (iv); see DhKoś 3, III, 1696a 22-24, b 3-9 etc. The latter are either fourteen or sixteen, in accordance with whether one includes the Mātṛs and Lokamātṛs mentioned in the verses listing the recipients *(mātaro lokamātaraḥ).* Some take these plural nouns as merely qualifying the fourteen singular names. According to Śrīdatta and others, the mother called Ātmadevatā in this list is whoever is one's *(ātma-)* family or personal goddess *(kuladevatā, iṣṭadevatā);* see ibid. 1695b 3; 1696b 1, 10; 1702a 11.

(134) KāśmKarmKPaddh folio 295r14-15, 18-19: *ekāntī d < e > vat < ā > yā < sā > kālasaṃ-karṣaṇī parā / ... saṃkarṣaṇī nāma devī ekāntī hy atha socyate /.*

(135) KāśmKarmKPaddh folio 295v19-296r3: *ekavaktrāṃ cāṣṭabhujāṃ trinetrābharaṇair yutām / kapālakhaṭvāṅgadharāṃ pāśāṅkuśakarārpitāṃ varadābhayahastāṃ ca khaḍgaśūlad-harāṃ śubhām / śuddhasphaṭikavarṇābhāṃ padmārūḍhāṃ vicintayet /.*

noose and a goad, the gestures of generosity and protection, a sword and a trident, shining white as crystal.

Evidently this is closely related to the Śūleśvarī icon of the seventeen-syllabled *vidyā* of Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī. Śūleśvarī has a knife where Ekāntavāsinī has a sword; but with the exception of this minor difference the four weapons attributed to Śūleśvarī by the *Jayadrathayāmala* are the attributes of the four principal hands of Ekāntavāsinī.

8.3. Siddhalakṣmī

I have encountered no representation of this Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī, either painted or sculpted. However two eleventh or twelfth century Kashmirian bronzes (Plates 1 and 2)[136] depict a form of the goddess which differs only slightly from that of Ekāntavāsinī Kāla-saṃkarṣiṇī. She certainly belongs to the same iconic type. She is five-faced rather than one-faced, and ten-armed rather than eight-armed; but she too is white and eight of her ten hands show the same attributes as Ekāntavāsinī — only a book and a hatchet *(ṭaṅkaḥ)* are added. Naturally, the colour of her body is not represented in a bronze. However, the deity may be identified as Siddhalakṣmī on the evidence of the visualization text for this goddess found in the Kashmirian handbooks of Tantric ritual;[137] and these record her

(136) The term Kashmirian here includes neighbouring areas within the sphere of Kashmirian culture, these two bronzes being said to be from Kangra and Himachal Pradesh (Pal 1975: 226, 228). For reproductions see Chhabra 1966; Sharma 1971; Pal 1975, plates 89 and 90 (pp. 226-229); and Mitchell, Lampert and Holland 1982, 71 (colour plate of exhibit 455). Chhabra (1966) identifies the image as Svacchandabhairavī, consort of Svacchandabhairava. But that deity's consort is not Svacchandabhairavī but Aghoreśvarī, is eighteen-armed and has quite different hand-attributes; see SvT 2. 88-97b and 114c-116, which describe Svac-chandabhairava in detail and his consort briefly, saying (115cd) that her from is identical with his [with regard to hand-attributes and other such particulars].

(137) AgnikPaddh folio 73r 7-: *devīṃ śuddhasphaṭikadhavalāṃ pañcavaktrāṃ trinetrāṃ dorbhir yuktāṃ daśabhir abhitaḥ śobhitāṃ ratnahāraiḥ / kādyaṃ khaḍgaṃ sṃim amasṃaṃ śūlam acchācchadhārāṃ sārāt sāraṃ varam anavaraṃ dakṣahastair vahantīṃ // utkhaṭvāṅgaṃ kaṭhinavikaṭaṃ ṭaṅkam ūrjasviṭaṅkaṃ pāśaṃ jñānāmṛtarasamayaṃ pustakaṃ cābhayaṃ ca / kāmaṃ vāmaiḥ śubhakaratalair bibhratīṃ viśvavandyāṃ padmapretopari kṛtapadaṃ siddha-lakṣmīṃ namāmi //.* This same text is included in the DevīdhyRatnM, p. 68 with *muṇḍaṃ* wrongly for *khaḍgaṃ* in the first verse. AgnikPaddh has the following verse to be recited as one makes the final, full oblation to the goddess *(pūrṇādhyānam): khaṭvāṅgakādya-varadābhayaśūlaṭaṅkapāśāṅkuśāsivarapustaka*hastapadmām *(padmahastām)* / *pañcānanāṃ* daśa*(vasu[*against sense and AgnikPaddh[2]*])bhujāṃ girisādhirūḍhāṃ tvāṃ dhyāyato 'sti bhuvi kasya narasya bhītiḥ //.* The two bronzes in question agree with these *dhyānas,* except that the former do not adhere to the latters' distribution of the hand-attributes to left and right. The hands on the viewer's right show from top to bottom a goad, a manuscript, a noose, the gesture of generosity and a hatchet *(ṭaṅkaḥ).* Those on the left show a sword, a trident, a skull-staff, a skull-bowl and the gesture of protection. The bronzes provide a clear illustration of the meaning of *padmapretopari kṛtapadām* in the Kashmirian visualization text, i.e. 'resting on a lotus and the Transcended [Sadāśiva].'

whiteness, as do the slightly different *dhyānas* employed for her cult in the Kathmandu valley.[138] The similarity between the icons of Siddhalakṣmī and Kālasaṃkarṣinī is backed by a close association in ritual practice. Siddhalakṣmī is taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, a work devoted to the cults of various forms of Kālasamkarṣiṇī;[139] in the *Kālasaṃkarṣaṇīmata* the worship of Siddhalakṣmī is a constituent of the cult of that goddess;[140] and in the Nepalese text of the annual Kaula *pavitrārohaṇa* ritual of the Uttarāmnāya the icon of Siddhalakṣmī is associated with a seventeen-syllabled *vidyā* which is evidently a variant of the basic Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī *mantra.*[141] Furthermore, her cult in Nepal is often combined with that of Guhyakālī. The cult of that goddess is a product of the tradition of Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī worship represented by the *Jayadrathayāmala*; and it incorporates the associated tradition of the Krama.[142]

9. ABHINAVAGUPTA ON VISUALIZATION

9.1. In his account of the regular cult *(nityakarma)* performed by the officiant as he prepares to carry out a ceremony of initiation *(dīkṣā)* Abhinavagupta has the following to say on the subject of the installation *(nyāsaḥ)* and visualization of the three goddesses :[143]

> [The officiant] should install the three Bhairavas and the three goddesses as follows : Bhairavasadbhāva [*jh-kṣ-hūṃ* (TĀ 30. 16c - 17b)] on the central[lo-tus], Ratiśekhara [*r-y-l-vūṃ* (ibid. 10c - 11b)] on the [lotus to his] right, and

---

(138) See TridaśaḍāmPratyaṅgVNT folios 2v2-3r3 *(Tridaśaḍāmaramahātantra)*, 19r6-v4 *(Siddhalakṣmīmata)*, 28v6-29r5 *(Umāyāmala)*, 33r4-5 *(Umāyāmalapūjākrama)*, 43r6-44r2 *(Siddhilakṣmīpañcaśataka)*, 73v2 *(Kālasaṃkarṣaṇīmata);* GuhyKāPūV folio 3v3-5 *(Siddhilakṣ-mīpūjāpaddhati)* ; UttĀmnPavĀrohV folio 8v3-5. A fine Newar bronze of Siddhalakṣmī (locally 'Siddhilakṣmī'), which follows the *dhyāna* of the *Kālasaṃkarṣaṇīmata*, is reproduced in Macdonald and Vergati Stahl 1979, 50.

(139) JayadYāmT *ṣaṭka* 2, last *kalpa*.

(140) See TridaśaḍāmPratyVNT folios 59r1-83r 6.

(141) UttĀmnPavĀrohV.

(142) See, e.g., GuhyKāPūV for this combination, also TantrDigUnkN, a Nepalese digest of Tantric sources on the cults of these two goddesses. On the Uttarāmnāya, Guhyakālī and the Krama see Sanderson 1988, 682-686. See ibid. Fig. 36.6 for a drawing of Guhyakālī following Newar models.

(143) TĀ 15. 323b-329b: *...parikalpayet / madhye bhairavasadbhāvaṃ dakṣiṇe ratiśekha-ram // 323 // navātmānaṃ vāmatas taddevīvad bhairavatrayam / madhye parāṃ pūrṇacandra-pratimāṃ dakṣiṇe punaḥ // 324 // parāparāṃ raktavarṇāṃ kiṃcidugrāṃ na bhīṣaṇām / aparāṃ vāmaśṛṅge tu bhīṣaṇāṃ kṛṣṇapiṅgalām // 325 // prāgvad dvidhātra śodhaiva nyāso dehe yathā kṛtaḥ / tataḥ sāṃkalpikaṃ yuktaṃ vapur āsāṃ vicintayet // 326 // kṛtyabhedānusāreṇa dvicatuḥṣaḍbhujādikam / kapālaśūlakhaṭvāṅgavarābhayaghaṭādike(kam) // 327 // vāmadak-ṣiṇasaṃsthānacitratvaṃ(tvāt) parikalpayet / vastuto viśvarūpās tā devyo bodhātmikā yataḥ // 328 // anavacchinnacinmātrasārāḥ syur apavṛktaye /.*

The goddess Siddhalakṣmī. Panjab, Kangra Valley, 11th-12th c. Bronze. Height: 22,2cm. Pan-Asian Collection.

The goddess Siddhalakṣmī. Panjab, Kangra Valley, 11th-12th c.
Bronze. Height: 36,7cm. National Museum, New-Delhi.

Navātman [r-h-r-kṣ-m-l-v-yūṃ (ibid. 11c 12b)] on the [lotus to his] left; then Parā [white] as the full moon on the central [lotus], Parāparā on [her] right, red and somewhat ferocious (kiṃcidugrā [144]) but not terrifying, and Aparā on the [lotus of the] cuspid on her left, terrifying and red-black. He should then subject them to the same double six-fold mantra-installation to which he has already subjected his body. [145] Thereafter he may contemplate [the goddesses in detail, visualizing] whichever of their desiderative (sāṃkalpikam) forms [146] may be appropriate, i.e. with two, four, six or more arms, according to which of the various goals of worship he is pursuing; and [in that case] he should variously dispose in their left and right hands such attributes as the skull-bowl (kapālam), the trident (triśūlam), the skull-staff (khaṭvāṅgaḥ), the gestures of generosity (varaḥ) and protection (abhayam), and the jar [of nectar] (ghaṭaḥ). [147]
In reality these goddesses are consciousness itself. They are therefore embodied as everythihg that exists [rather than in any single form]. Consequently, if they are to bestow liberation [through their worship] they must be [contemplated as being] essentially this same, unlimited, [148] uninflected consciousness (cinmātram).

Evidently Abhinavagupta considers the greater part of the details with which we have been concerned to be relevant only to those who are performing desiderative rites. Since the particulars of these rites are outside the scope of the Tantrāloka he does no more than exemplify these details (the number of arms and the attributes in the hands) without telling us which combinations fit which goal. [149] The performer of nondesiderative worship is required to visualize the goddesses, but only, it seems, in their most basic outline : he is to grasp their colours and moods alone; and then to submerge these icons within the entirely aniconic contemplation that the goddesses are ultimately none other than the imageless power of consciousness itself.

---

(144) For kiṃcidagrāṃ (ed.) read kiṃcidugrāṃ following sense and MālVijUT 8. 73b.

(145) See TĀ 15. 239c-258 (viśeṣanyāsaḥ).

(146) I take the term sāṃkalpikam here to be synonymous with kāmyam and therefore to refer to those forms of the icon which are inflected for contemplation in desiderative cults (kāmyakarma).

(147) The edition of 327c-328b has kapālaśūlakhaṭvāṅgavarābhayaghaṭādikam // vāma-dakṣiṇasaṃsthānacitratvāt parikalpayet /. But this would mean that Abhinavagupta required the sādhaka to 'accomplish the skull-bowl, trident etc. because of the diversity of left and right positions.' This is absurd. I therefore emend -ghaṭādikam to ghaṭādike, and -citratvāt to -citratvam.

(148) By 'unlimited' (anavacchinna-) he means 'not circumscribed by place, time or form;' see, e.g., ŚivSūVim on 1.1.

(149) See TĀ 26. 11bcd: nityanaimittike bruve(dhruve) / kāmyavarjaṃ yataḥ kāmāś citrās citrābhyupāyakāḥ //, 'I shall teach regular and incidental ritual, but not the desiderative; for desires being manifold are accomplished by an equal diversity of means.' My emendation of the edition's dhruve to bruve gives sense at the cost of minimal emendation, since ba and dha are easily confused in the Śāradā script.

9.2. This prescription is idiosyncratic. The norm is that a Tantric cult, whether Saiddhāntika or not, has a goal-neutral, common form of its deity *(sādhāranam / sāmānyam rūpam)*, which serves in all modes of worship, or in all but the desiderative, that is, in all regular *(nityam)* ahd incidental *(naimittikam)* rites, the latter including the ceremonies of initiation *(dīkṣā)*. Where specific forms are taught for specific purposes they are generally modifications of this neutral archetype.[150]

It might be thought that Abhinavagupta's dichotomy between nondesiderative and desiderative visualizations differs from this norm simply in this, that the nondesiderative archetype is an inchoate base to which desiderative details are added, while in the normal practice the secondary forms modify an archetype that is certainly fully detailed and is often more elaborate than they are. Thus the neutral and all-purpose image in the Siddhānta is the ten-armed Sadāśiva combining Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Vāmadeva and Sadyojāta (the personifications of the five *brahmamantras*).[151] One or other of these component deities is worshipped if one seeks a particular goal.[152] While the composite Sadāśiva is five-faced and ten-armed, they are each single-faced and have two, four, eight, two and two arms respectively.[153] However, this difference is the consequence of a quite different perspective. In the norm the neutral image is *all*-purpose *(sarvārtham*[154]) : it is not limited to the seekers of liberation. On the contrary, a icon for the liberationists is included among the modifications.[155] Thus while in the norm the

---

(150) See Mṛg KP 3.41-45b and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's commentary on the icon of Sadāśiva and its variants in the Siddhānta. In the cult of Svacchandabhairava too the basic image is goal neutral; see SvT 2. 88b-97; 97ab *(sarvakāmaphalapradam)*. It coexists with such desiderative variants as Vyādhibhakṣasvacchanda, Koṭarākṣasvacchanda, Jvarasvacchanda and Vṛddhasvacchanda, for whom see SvT 9 (Koṭarākṣa-), SvTU 4 (9) 31^{17}-32^5 (Vyādhibhakṣa-), and TantrColl folio 421r6-v3 (Jvara- Vyādhibhakṣa- and Vṛddha-).

(151) These pan-Śaiva *mantras* were inherited from the pre-āgamic Pāśupata tradition, and ultimately from the Yajurveda *(Taittirīyāraṇyaka* 10. 43-47).

(152) See Mṛg KP 3. 45-49c and commentary.

(153) See ĪśānŚivGDP KP 12. 34-39.

(154) Mṛg KP 3. 48ab: *sarvasiddhyai sādhāranam;* 44d: *sarvārtham sāmudāyikam.*

(155) See, e.g., Mṛg KP 3. 45: *tac ca sādhāranam rūpam vaiśeṣikam ato 'nyathā / muktyartham sphaṭikākāram prasannam cetasā smaret //.* The same is seen in non-Saiddhāntika traditions. It occurs, for example, in the cult of Mantramātṛkā, one of the four Pratyaṅgirā deities of the JayadYāmT. Having described her as black, four-armed, carrying skull-bowl, skull-staff, noose and cudgel, and mounted on Sadāśiva, the text gives alternative colours for purposes other than that of countering malevolent magic (her basic function), including white for liberation; see JayadYāmT *ṣaṭka* 3, *paṭala* 9 *(pratyaṅgirāvidhiḥ)*, 39c-43b: *dhyāyet kalpāntakālāgnilakṣapra(ura)timabhīṣaṇām // 39 // kāk(l)ālikokilādīnām *nibhā* kāntim subhairavam / caturbhujām ekavīrām netratritayabhāsurām // 40 // mahāpretasamārūḍhām pātrakhaṭvāṅgadhāriṇīm / pāśamudgarahastām tām vasārudhiralampaṭām // 41 //*

---

movement from archetype to ectype is from the general to the particular in all its varieties, here it is a movement from the formless nonduality of the uninflected consciousness sought by the liberationist *(mumukṣuḥ)* into the plurality and detail required by the class of initiates which seeks specific goals through desiderative worship *(bubhukṣuḥ)*.

9.3.1. One may wonder why, if this interpretation is correct, Abhinavagupta did not exclude form entirely from worship for liberation. That this was the direction of his thought is evident enough from his interpretation of the *Parātriṃśikā* on the subject of the regular worship of Parā in the Anuttara system. That text describes the goddess in this context as "full of all the *tattvas* and beautified with all [manner of] adornments".[156] He refuses to allow the second half of this description *(sarvābharanabhūṣitām*) its literal meaning. Instead he raises it on to the level of the first by forcing it to yield a purely non-visual, metaphysical sense. This is achieved by means of an *ad hoc* etymology *(nirvacanam)*. The known *(rūḍha-)* lexical sense of the word *ābharanam* ('adornment') is rejected in favour of one constructed etymologically by reactivating the meanings of its constituent parts : *bharanam* from $\sqrt{}$ *bhṛ* 'to support' in the meaning 'the action of supporting', and the preverb *ā-* in the meaning 'entirely' *(ā samantād bharanam*). The word *sarva-* ('all'), which in the literal sense ('all adornments') is in apposition to *-ābharana-*, is now taken in the locative (in a *saptamītatpuruṣa* compound). Thus where the text intended us to understand that the goddess is 'beautified with all [manner of] adornments' Abhinavagupta instructs us to read 'beautified by total support in everything.' He explains that 'total support in everything' *(sarvābharanam)* is the fact that as autonomous Consciousness she establishes identity with the totality *(sarvātmīkaranam)* in everything *(sarvatra)*, even in the smallest constituent of matter *(paramāṇāv api)*[157]. He concludes and explains :[158]

So it is that there is no mention [in this text] of the visualization of weapons

---

mahodagrām mahābhīmām kṣayamārutanisvanām / evamvidhā <m> yantranāśe kṛtyākhārkhodamardane // 42 // cintayet parameśānīm abhicārupramardane / ... mokṣe śuddhendurūpinīm /. This visualization is in the Kashmirian AgnikPaddh, folio 74r with certain variants, notably *kākālikokilādīnām tulyakāntinibhopamām / caturbhujām ekavaktrām... / śvetapretasamārūḍhām ...*

(156) PT 30cd: *sarvatattvasampūrnām sarvābharanabhūṣitām //.*

(157) PTViv 278$^{6\text{-}7}$(265$^{13\text{-}14}$): *sarvatra paramāṇāv api yad ā samantād ābharanam sarvātmīkaranam.*

(158) PTViv 278$^{9\text{-}10}$(265$^{16\text{-}18}$): *ata eva viśiṣṭākṛtyāyudhādidhyānam eva noktam tasya nirmeyatvāt.*

or of any of the other features with specific form [that usually constitute the icon of a Tantric *mantra*-deity]; and the reason for this is that [all] such [visualizations] are [merely] the creations [of that goddess, and therefore inadequate as representations of the goddess herself].

9.3.2. The same formlessness is taught in the *Tantrāloka*, though at a distance from the part of that work which is devoted to the Trika's rituals. For in the introductory chapter, in which he gives an outline of his soteriology, he explains that:[159]

The inner creativity *(pratibhā)* which is the essence of the unseconded Lord Consciousness *(saṃvinnāthasya)* is worshipped [by *sādhakas*] as limited configurations of that consciousness's surging power; and these are either pacific *(saumyam)* or terrible *(anyat)* [according to the worshipper's purpose].

He exemplifies such inflected worship with a *sādhana* whose purpose is to restore health and vigour *(puṣṭiḥ, āpyāyanam)* and then sums up his position as follows:[160]

The [same] Lord of the Universe, Bhairava as Consciousness, is worshipped *specifically* by seekers of lesser goals, and *non-specifically* by those whose only purpose is liberation.

The non-specific form of this Bhairava is, of course, consciousness itself, the impersonal identity of the initiate,[161] uncircumscribed by place or time, and formless.[162]

9.4. Why, then, does Abhinavagupta allow the goddesses form in his account of their regular, liberationist cult in his *Tantrāloka*? The answer to this question is surely that he has gone as far as he can in this direction given the constraints imposed on him by the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra,* the āgama of which the *Tantrāloka* is both

---

(159) TĀ 1. 116 : *ekasya saṃvinnāthasya hy āntarī pratibhā tanuḥ / saumyaṃ vānyan mitaṃ saṃvidūrmicakram upāsyate //.*

(160) TĀ 1.123: *yasmād viśveśvaro bodhabhairavaḥ samupāsyate / avacchedānavac-chidbhyāṃ bhogamokṣārthibhir janaiḥ //.*

(161) This view that the deity to be worshipped is the undifferentiated identity of the worshipper would seem to point to the transcendence of worship itself. Jayaratha has it attacked by the Vedic ritualists on precisely these grounds in his commentary on TĀ 1. 124c-125b: *nanu devatoddeśena dravyatyāgo yāga ity ukteḥ dravyatyāgārtham uddiṣṭaiva devatā bhavati na ca* **bodhaikarūpasya svātmatattvasya** *tathātvenoddeśo 'stiti(?. sti) katham asya yājyatvam /,* 'Surely [, the Mīmāṃsaka will say,] 'worship', or 'offering' *(yāgaḥ)* is defined as the formal abandonment of an owned object with the naming of a deity [as the recipient]. It follows from this definition that nothing can be the deity [in an offering] which is not named [in the recited text of the ritual] for the purpose of such abandonment. Now that **identity of one's self,** whose only substance is consciousness, is [nowhere] named for such a purpose. How, then, can it be the 'recipient of the offering.'?

(162) See TĀ 4. 196-199.

---

commentary *(ślokavārtikam)* and Paddhati.[163] For the core of the passage from the *Tantrāloka* translated above on the installation and visualization of the deities is a paraphrase of the following verses of that text:[164]

Having visualized the [three] Śiva-*mantras* [Bhairavasadbhāva etc.] who are to be installed first, he should visualize the Śakti Parā on the central [lotus] and the other two [Śaktis] to her right and left: Parāparā, with the appearance proper to her, red and mighty, **adopting whatever form accords with the worshipper's desire,**[165] somewhat ferocious but not terrifying; the goddess Aparā on the [lotus of the] left cuspid, terrifying and red-black, **adopting whatever form accords with the worshipper's desire,** banishing the ills of her devotees; and the goddess Parā [on the central lotus], nourishing, shining [white] as countless moons. Then when he has done the six fold installation of the Śakti-*mantras*...

Abhinavagupta, then, could hardly prescribe non-visual meditation on the goddesses in place of the usual visualization without openly contradicting his source.

9.5.1. Yet he manages an interpretation of these verses which goes a long way towards that goal, by exploiting the circumstance that the *Mālinīvijayottara* states no more than the basic characteristics of the three goddesses before adding that these may be adjusted [in desiderative worship *(kāmyakarma)*] in order to accomplish specific aims.

9.5.2. Now it does not say that these inflected forms are more developed than the neutral archetypes. Nor is that implied by the brevity of the descriptions. It is true that these cover only the goddesses' colours and moods. But such brevity is a common feature

---

(163) See TĀ 1.14-17.

(164) MālVijUT 8. 71d-74: *(anucintayet) ... pūrvanyāsaṃ śivātmakam // 71 // tato madhye parāṃ śaktiṃ dakṣiṇottarayor dvayam / parāparāṃ svarūpeṇa raktavarṇāṃ mahābalām // 72 // icchārūpadharāṃ dhyātvā kiṃcidugrāṃ na bhīṣaṇām / aparāṃ vāmaśṛṅge tu bhīṣaṇām kṛṣṇapiṅgalāṃ / 73 // icchārūpadharāṃ devīṃ praṇatārtivināśinīm / parāṃ cāpyāyanīṃ devīṃ candrakoṭyayutaprabhām // 74 // ṣaḍvidhe 'pi kṛte śākte mūrtyādāv api ...*

(165) This translates *icchārūpadharām.* My translation of this rather vague expression (lit. 'desire-form-assuming') follows, e.g., NeT 10.14b-16b, where its meaning is clear: *... anusmaret / (14b) ... icchārūpadharaṃ devam icchāsiddhiphalapradam / yādṛśenaiva vapuṣā sādhakas tam anusmaret // 15 // tādṛśaṃ bhajate rūpaṃ ... /,* 'He should visualize ... the god in whatever form accords with his desire, [that is], as the bestower of the *siddhi* he desires. He adopts any form in which a *sādhaka* visualizes him.' Kṣemarāja ad loc. analyses *icchā-rūpadhara-* as follows: *cidbhairava eva tattatsiddhyabhilāṣukatattatsādhakāśayecchayā tat tad rūpaṃ gṛhṇātīty arthaḥ /,* 'The meaning is that Bhairava as Consciousness **takes on** [< *-dharaḥ*] various **forms** [< *-rūpa-*] through desire [< *icchā-*], that is, according to the intention of this or that *sādhaka* seeking this or that *siddhi.*'

in āgamic accounts of ritual, particularly in texts like the *Mālinī-vijayottara* which say that they are based on more detailed sources, in this case the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. [166] The normal procedure when interpreting such passages for practical application is to take any absence of information to mean that the text is intended to be supplemented from the nearest equal or subordinate scriptural source within the ordered whole of the Śaiva revelation. Thus, for example, the Śaiva who follows the ritual of the *Mālinīvijayottara* finds that this āgama instructs him to make offerings to the deities that guard the entrance to his place of worship but does not indicate their names or their positioning about the door. This might be taken to mean that he is to worship them collectively, forming a single *mantra* in which they are named simply as 'the door-guardians' *(*oṃ dāṃ dvārapālebhyo namaḥ)*. In fact one is to read in the names and positions of the deities from the *Triśirobhairavatantra*, a work which like the *Mālinīvijayottara* belongs to the Trika system of ritual. The method, according to Jayaratha, is always to search the canon until one requires no further information in order to translate one's text into practice *(apekṣānivṛttiḥ)*. If one does not find what one needs in texts on the same level, one is to go to the one beneath it; and if one does not find it there, one is to descend to the one below that, until one reaches the āgamas of the Siddhānta, the level of the greatest generality. In this hierarchy of texts the higher is the more specialized : it needs to say only what is not available to be read in from below. [167] So if a silence within a superordinate text is not to initiate this process of supplementation, it must be prevented from doing so by some specific or general instruction.

9.5.3. No such instruction occurs in the *Mālinīvijayottara* to affect the interpretation of its visualization texts. Abhinavagupta might appear, then, to have chosen to forget this principle of automatic supplementation in his eagerness to achieve an interpretation of the text which makes room for the ideal of imageless contemplation. There is, however, no need to assume this. If the *Mālinīvijayottara* is at the highest level of the Śaiva scriptural corpus, as he maintained, it ought after all to show some awareness of this ideal. For there are other texts in the subcorpus of the Trika which

---

(166) See MālVijUT 1.00; TĀ 37. 24c-25b: *vidyāpīṭhapradhānaṃ ca siddhayoge(ī)ś-varīmatam // tasyāpi paramaṃ sāraṃ mālinīvijayottaram. /*

(167) See TĀV 3 (4) 279¹-281⁸ for this procedure and its application to the reference to the door-guardians at MālVijUT 8. 16a *(tatra dvārapatīn iṣṭvā...).* It hardly needs to be pointed out that this ordering of text-levels in the Kashmirian exegesis corresponds only partly to the actual interrelations between the text-groups in question.

---

advocate it. By grouping the *Mālinīvijayottara* with these texts he primes it with a predisposition to transcend mere visualization; and this predisposition justifies him in reading its brief description of the goddesses as exhaustive rather than intentionally lacunose, so that even if it does not actually articulate the ideal dichotomy between formless deities and inflected icons which Abhinavagupta finds in the *Parātriṃśikā*, it nonetheless supports the principle of this dichotomy by teaching that the higher mode of worship practised by the liberationist is at least closer to the formless than that practised by the *sādhaka* in pursuit of limited goals. And because the text has been read as pointing the wor-shipper towards this principle Abhinavagupta can claim that it implies that one should be aware as one visualizes these subtler icons that the reality which they embody is nothing other than this same formless power of consciousness. He can require the wor-shipper to project the icons in his imagination only to dissolve them into the metaphysical *concept* of his own identity.

9.5.4. This same shift of emphasis from objective image to subjective concept is also required by Abhinavagupta in his account of the summoning and visualization of the deities in the daily cult to be carried out by all initiates. [168] When the worshipper has completed the internal cult which always precedes the external : [169]

> He should meditate on the cult-platform *(sthaṇḍilam)*, imagining that it is transparent, like a crystal or a pure radiant sky. [Concentrating on these qualities] he should identify it with consciousness. In this [mirror-like] consciousness he should contemplate the images of the deities as reflections and himself as the reflected. [170]

---

(168) All initiates who are competent-and-obliged *(adhikṛtaḥ)* to perform rituals have this daily duty. Those who are not required to do this or any other Tantric ritual áre (i) the subclass of *putrakas* who have received *nirbījā* rather than *sabījā dīkṣā*, and (ii) *lokadharmisā-dhakas*. For these and their exemption see TĀ 15. 1-2b and commentary.

(169) TĀ 26. 41-42b: *tatas tat sthaṇḍilaṃ vidhravyomasphaṭikanirmalam / bodhātmakaṃ samālokya tatra svaṃ devatāgaṇaṃ // pratibimbatayā paśyed bimbatvena ca bodhataḥ /.*

(170) Abhinavagupta has expressed himself obscurely here. He could be taken to mean that one is to look upon 'one's deities' *(svaṃ devatāgaṇam)* as both the reflection *(pratibim-batayā)* and that which is reflected *(bimbatvena ca)*. This, of course, lacks reference to the self of the worshipper; and the verse would not be relevant to the context in which I have cited it. However, I find the 'self' in *svam*, taking it in its less common but well attested use as a substantive. In this reading the verb has two objects: *svam* and *devatāgaṇam*, 'self' and 'the deities'; the two adverbial expressions *pratibimbatayā* 'as reflection' and *bimbatvena* 'as reflected' qualify meditation on these two. But, of course, the order is inverted: it must be the self which one is to see as the reflected *(bimbam)* and the deities as the reflections, not vice versa. In favour of this interpretation there is the parallel passage in Abhinavagupta's *Tantrasāra* (179¹⁶⁻¹⁸): *tatra hṛdye sthaṇḍile vimalamakuravad dhyāte svam eva rūpaṃ yājyade-vatācakrābhinnaṃ mūrtibimbitam iva dṛṣṭvā...* 'Having meditated on that pleasing surface as

9.6. Thus Abhinavagupta directs the awareness of the worshipper to a point beyond both ritual and devotion. For if the initiate realizes that the deities are nothing less than his own liberated identity, then ritual, which is based on an imagined difference between offerer and recipient, will be superfluous. Nor can his identity be circumscribed by devotion to one deity rather than another, for all will be recognized in their diverse *mantras* and icons as so many projections of the one autonomous, self-articulating consciousness.

9.7. This doctrine that the forms of the deities in ritual and devotion are merely provisional, to be abandoned at higher levels of practice, did not enter the Trika with Abhinavagupta or his immediate predecessors in Kashmir. It was already fully explicit in the *Vijñānabhairavatantra*, an āgama which does not deal with ritual but can nonetheless be assigned to the Trika as I have defined it at the beginning of this paper, since it makes it clear that it is the ritual of the Trika that it is transcending. It tells the followers of this system how they must aspire to see their rituals. It begins as follows :[171]

> The goddess said, "From its source in the < *Rudrayāmala* > / < the union of Rudra and his Śakti >[172] and in scriptures of ever greater essentiality you have taught me, O Lord, the Trika division [of your revelation].[173] But still

a perfect mirror, and having come to see himself on [the surface of] that [mirror] as identical with the series of deities to be worshipped, as though the [visualized] icons [of those deities] were his own reflection...'

(171) VijñBh 1-16: *(śrīdevy uvāca /) śrutaṃ deva mayā sarvaṃ rudrayāmalasambhavam / trikabhedam aśeṣeṇa sārāt sāravibhāgaśaḥ // 1 // adyāpi na nivṛtto me saṃśayaḥ parameśvara / kiṃ rūpaṃ tattvato deva śabdarāśikalāmayam // 2 // kiṃ vā navātmabhedena bhairave bhairavākṛtau / triśirobhedabhinnaṃ vā kiṃ vā śaktitrayātmakam // 3 // nādabindumayaṃ vāpi kiṃ candrārdhanirodhikāḥ / cakrārūḍham anackaṃ vā kiṃ vā śaktisvarūpakam // 4 // parāparāyāḥ sakalam aparāyāś ca vā punaḥ / parāyā yadi tadvat syāt paratvaṃ tad virudhyate // 5 // na hi varṇavibhedena dehabhedena vā bhavet / paratvaṃ niṣkalatvena sakalatve na tad bhavet // 6 // prasādaṃ kuru me nātha niḥśeṣaṃ chinddhi saṃśayam / (bhairava uvāca /) sādhu sādhu tvayā pṛṣṭam tantrasāram idaṃ priye // 7 // gūhanīyatamam bhadre tathāpi kathayāmi te / yat kiṃcit sakalaṃ rūpaṃ bhairavasya prakīrtitam // 8 // tad asāratayā devi vijñeyaṃ śakrajālavat / māyāsvapnopamaṃ caiva gandharvanagaropamam // 9 // dhyānārthaṃ bhrāntabuddhīnāṃ kriyāḍambaravartinām / kevalaṃ varṇitaṃ puṃsāṃ vikalpanihatātmanām // 10 // tattvato na navātmāsau śabdarāśir na bhairavaḥ / na cāsau triśirā devo na ca śaktitrayātmakaḥ // 11 // nādabindumayo vāpi na candrārdhanirodhikāḥ / na ca śaktisvarūpakaḥ // 12 // aprabuddhamatīnāṃ hi etā bālavibhīṣikāḥ / mātṛmodakavat sarvaṃ pravṛttyarthham udāhṛtam // 13 // dikkālakalanonmuktā deśoddeśāviśeṣiṇī / vyapadeṣṭum aśakyāsāv akathyā paramārthataḥ // 14 // antaḥsvānubhavānandā vikalponmuktagocarā / yāvasthā bharitākārā bhairavī bhairavātmanaḥ // 15 // tad vapus tattvato jñeyaṃ vimalaṃ viśvapūraṇam / evaṃvidhe pare tattve kaḥ pūjyaḥ kaś ca tṛpyati // 16 //.*

(172) This second interpretation is that of Kṣemarāja ad loc. In favour of the first see VijñBh 162.

(173) Kṣemarāja takes the ascent in essentiality to begin from the SiYogM followed by the MālVijUT; see ad loc.: *siddhāmālinyuttarādi.*

my doubts persist. What is the real form of Bhairava the terrible ? Is it the [fifty letters of] of Śabdarāśi ? Is it Navātman ?[174] Is it Triśirobhairava ?[175] Is it the three Śaktis [Parā, Parāparā, Aparā] ? Is it the Point *(binduḥ)* and the Resonance *(nādaḥ)*? Is it the Half-moon, the Impeder and the other [subtle levels of the *mantras*' utterance] ?[176] Is it the vowelless *(anackam)* [consonant] installed in the circle [with each of the vowels in turn] ? Is it Śakti ?[177] Furthermore if Parā is iconic like Parāparā and Aparā, then the absoluteness *(paratvam)* [claimed by her name] is contradicted. She cannot be absolute if she has a particular colour and form. To be absolute she must be formless *(niṣkala-)*. She cannot be absolute if she is qualified by form *(sakala-)*. O Lord, favour me. Remove my doubts entirely."
Bhairava replied, "I congratulate you, beloved; for the answer to your question is the very heart of the Tantras. O virtuous one, even though this is the ultimate secret I shall reveal it to you. Know, O goddess, that all the structured forms which I have taught as Bhairava's [in the various scriptures of the Trika] are without essence. They are like rainbows, like the illusions created by magicians, like dreams, like the [imagined] cities of the Gandharva celestials [in the sky]. I have taught them only so that those who are caught up in the empty turmoil of ritual, being confused and overwhelmed by the dichotomies of thought, may have a means of concentrating their awareness in meditation. In reality Bhairava is not Navātman, nor Śabdarāśi, nor the Three-headed [Triśirobhairava], not the three Śaktis. He is not the Point or the Resonance. He is not the Half-moon, the Impeder and the rest. He is not multiplied through entering the wheel [of combinations with the vowels]. Nor is he the [all-encompassing] Śakti [Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī]. For [all] these [forms] are strictly for the unenlightened. I have taught them only as a means of setting people on the right path, as a mother uses threats and sweets to influence her children's behaviour. Know that there is only one 'form' which is ultimately real : the spotless [reality] which fills everything, the state of 'Bhairava'[called] 'Bhairavī' [because it is] absolutely replete *(bharitākārā)*,[178] being beyond determination by direction or time, unlocated, impossible to indicate, ultimately indescribable, blissful with the self's innermost experience

(174) In TĀ Navātman is simply the consort of Aparā, the lowest of the three goddesses. But in SiYogM he is also worshipped as the highest deity, in the heart of the assemblage of Vīras and Yoginīs known as the Khecarīcakra or Khacakravyūha; see *paṭala* 20 (folios 35v-42r).

(175) Presumably the text refers to the eponymous deity of the lost *Triśirobhairavatantra.*

(176) See, e.g., TĀ 1. 63. Abhinavagupta refers here to 'the *Dīkṣottara* and other texts' (62cd); and the *Dīkṣottara* is an āgama of the Siddhānta rather than the Trika. But the passages quoted by Jayaratha in his commentary of 1.63 are also found in the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāva* (folio 10r).

(177) This probably refers to Kālasaṃkarṣiṇī / Mātṛsadbhāva, the fourth Śakti, who unites the three goddesses; see, e.g., TĀ 3.68-70b.

(178) I take *bharitākārā* 'absolutely replete' as an etymology *(nirvacanam)* from √bhṛ 'to nourish, to fill' intended to explain why the name Bhairavī, lit. 'consort of Bhairava', is appropriate to *(anvartha-)* this transtheistic Absolute. The same etymology of Bhairava / Bhairavī is seen at JayadYāmT ṣaṭka 4 folio 88v 2-3: *bharaṇād bhairaveśvarī;* ibid. folio 202v 1: *bharaṇād bhairaveśvaram;* TĀ 1.96ab *(viśvaṃ bidharti poṣaṇa-(pūraṇa)dhāraṇayogena tena ca bhriyate /.* I am indebted to Eivind Kahrs [Cambridge] for the emendation *pūraṇa- > poṣaṇa-.* See Jayaratha ad loc.: **bibharti** *dhārayati poṣayati ca).*

of its own identity, free of all thought. Within such an Absolute how can one distinguish a recipient of worship or gratification ?"

It is this state of fullness, we are told, this complete centredness in the thoughtless essence of consciousness, rather than the composite images or *mantras* of ritual, that the Trika scriptures really mean when they speak of the goddess Parā.[179]

9.8. The *Vijñānabhairava* then details one hundred and twelve means of realizing union with this redefined goddess without recourse to ritual. Its closing section (verses 140-163) reaffirms this view of ordinary Tantric worship by translating on to the plane of abstract contemplation the acts of offering, visualizing the deity, cycling the *mantras*, and so forth, which compose it :[180]

> The goddess said, "If, O Lord Maheśvara, it is this that is the true form *(vapuḥ)* of Parā, then what place can there be in the state you have described for any *mantra (japyaḥ)* or its repetition ? What, Great Lord, could be visualized, worshipped and gratified ? How and why would there be oblations into fire *(homaḥ)* or the presentation of offerings to any other substrate of worship *(yāgaḥ)*? And what would there be to receive them ?" Bhairava replied, "In this [teaching] *(atra)*, doe-eyed one, such ritual procedures *(prakriyā)* are considered gross [if practised] external[ly] *(bāhyā)*.[181] At this level *(atra)* the repetition of the *mantras* is simply the cultivation of an ever more intense awareness of the ultimate reality. The *mantra* repeated accords [with this higher practice] *(īdṛśaḥ)*: it is the innate resonance [of that reality], the essence of [all] *mantras (mantrātmā)*. As for visualization, this is no longer the process of imagining [the deity with] a body, eyes, faces, [so many] arms, and the like, but simply a motionless, form-free *(nirākārā)* and unsupported *(nirāśrayā)* awareness [of its real nature]. Worship *(pūjā)* likewise is not what is accomplished by [offering] flowers and the rest. It is awareness made firm, dissolution into that final void [within consciousness] which is free of all thought *(nirvikalpe pare vyomni)*, through intense conviction [that this is the goal] *(ādarāt)*."

---

(179) This is the gist of the next verse, VijñBh 17: *evaṃvidhā bhairavasya yāvasthā parigīyate / sā parā pararūpeṇa parādevī prakīrtitā //*.

(180) VijñBh 142c-47: *(śrīdevy uvāca /) idaṃ yadi vapur deva parāyāś ca maheśvara // 142 // evamuktavyavasthāyāṃ japyate ko japaś ca kaḥ / dhyāyate ko mahānātha pūjyate kaś ca tṛpyati // 143 // hūyate kasya vā homo yāgaḥ kasya ca kiṃ katham / (śrībhairava uvāca /) eṣātra prakriyā bāhyā sthūlety eva mṛgekṣaṇe // 144 // bhūyo bhūyaḥ pare bhāve bhāvanā bhāvyate hi yā / japaḥ so 'tra svayaṃ nādo mantrātmā japya idṛśaḥ // 145 // dhyānaṃ hi niścalā buddhir nirākārā nirāśrayā / na tu dhyānaṃ śarīrākṣimukhahastaprakalpanā // 146 // pūjā nāma na puṣpādyair yā matiḥ kriyate dṛḍhā / nirvikalpe pare vyomni sā pūjā hy ādarāl layaḥ // 147 //*.

(181) I have followed the reading *sthūlety eva* given by Bhaṭṭa (/ Bhaṭṭāraka) Ānanda (VijñBhD 58[5]) rather than the *sthūleṣv eva* of Śivopādhyāya (VijñBhViv 129[12]).

9.9. I have examined elsewhere how in the cults of the Trika, of Kubjikā, Tripurasundarī, Svacchandabhairava, and Netranātha (Amṛteśvara[/-bhairava]), Abhinavagupta, Kṣemarāja, and south Indian scholars under their influence, have read this 'true ritual' *(akalpitārcādi)* back on to the rituals themselves, so that they could show how this gross level of practice, which after all was crucial to the institutional identity and hierarchy of these traditions, could still be seen as an effective means of liberation *(upāyaḥ)* for those incapable of purely cognitive or immediate methods.[182] This interpolation of non-dualistic meaning was far from complete. Not all the elements of Tantric ritual lent themselves equally to such semanticization. Nor, in fact, was completeness necessary. It was enough that a given order of worship *(paddhatiḥ)* should be overcoded in its general structure and principal particulars. What was not justified by being shown to signify the higher truths of the gnostic exegetes was not assumed to be meaningless. On the contrary, the text of ritual was treated as a mine of latent meaning always open to deeper and more thorough exegesis of this kind.

9.10.1. The decision to attribute meaning to one element and not to another is generally without particular significance. There are instances, however, in which absence of interpretation may be seen as expression of an exegete's doctrinal orientation. Abhinavagupta's treatment of the visualizations of the Trika looks to be just such a case. He adheres to the view expressed in the passage of the *Vijñānabhairava* quoted above that the reality to be realized through the Trika transcends the particulars of the deities' *mantras* just as much as it transcends those of their icons. Yet it is only in the case of the former that he is concerned to read in appropriate meaning. We have seen that he demonstrates to his readers how *sauḥ*, though a mere *mantra*, can function through ritual as a means of liberation because it expresses or embodies that state of all-inclusive autonomy; and he provides similar keys to the *mantras* of Parāparā, Aparā, and the two alphabet-deities Śabdarāśi and Mālinī.[183] But the mental icons, and therefore the painted, cast or incised represen-

---

(182) See Sanderson 1990.

(183) See PTViv 226[26]-227[1] (123[1-4]) on the *mantra* of Parāparā, referring to MālVijUT 4. 19-23; and PTViv 227[1-5] (124[4-10]) on the *mantra* of Aparā, referring to MālVijUT 4. 24. These verses of the MālVijUT explain the correspondence between the constituents of the *mantras* and the levels of the cosmic order. For the same for Śabdarāśi (/Mātṛkā) and Mālinī, the two alphabet-deities, see PTViv 219[27]-259[30] (98[3]-218[6]), TĀ 3. 66-197[b] (Śabdarāśi), and TĀV 9 (15) 68[1-15] (Mālinī). For an exhaustive treatment of the non-dualistic reading of the two alphabet-deities see Padoux (1963: 183-260).

tations of the deities based upon them, are left without any such justification. His lead was not followed by Kṣemarāja. For he, though adhering to Abhinavagupta's soteriology in all essentials, gives us elaborate and detailed metaphysical readings of the iconic attributes of Netranātha / Amṛteśvara and Svacchandabhairava in his surviving Tantric commentaries, those on the *Netratantra* and the *Svacchandatantra* respectively. He also wrote the *Bhairavā-nukaraṇastotra,* a hymn to Svacchandabhairava, whose form is a meditation on the non-dualistic meaning of each feature of that deity's icon. [184]

9.10.2. The key to this difference in exegetical policy lies in the fact that in Tantric ritual *mantras* are more real than visualized forms *(dhyānāni).* The identity of a Tantric deity rests principally in its *mantra* and only secondarily and dispensably in its icon. This principle is illustrated in Abhinavagupta's treatment of *Netratantra* 18. 119c-121b. That passage permits the officiant *(ācāryaḥ)* to install on behalf of the deceased at the place of cremation an image of a deity proper to the esoteric Bhairavāgamic tradition, namely a variant of Koṭarākṣabhairava, one of the ectypes of Svacchanda-bhairava. Since the installation *(pratiṣṭhā)* of a deity is understood to mean the installation of the *mantras* of that deity in an appro-priate material substrate, this permission might appear to contradict a fundamental rule of his system, namely that the *mantras* of the esoteric, non-Saiddhāntika traditions should never be established in idols within the public domain. He predicts this objection by ruling that the *Netratantra* refers not to the deity Bhairava in its essential identity as embodied in its *mantra,* but only to the physical represen-tation of the icon in an idol. The *mantra* which should be installed in a Bhairava idol of this public variety should come not from the Bhairava canon but should be one of the 'common' *(sādhāraṇa-),* exoteric *mantras* of the Siddhānta system such as the *mantra* of Netranātha himself. [185]

9.10.3. Where the various Śaiva cults are ranked according to the degree to which their methods approach ultimate, non-sequential intuition, as is the case in the Trika of Abhinavagupta, the omission

---

(184) See NeTU 1 (3) 73[10]-74[5]; SvTU 1 (2) 53[5]-55[19]; BhairAnukSt throughout; and Sanderson 1990.

(185) For this issue of the cremation ground Bhairavas see TĀ 27. 7-8 and commentary. This topic and the identity of the common *mantras* is covered in my forthcoming 'Idols and Other Substrates of Worship in the Trika.'

---

or suppression of the *dhyānas* of the deities of a cult will therefore signify that it is superior to the mainstream of Tantric worship. The outstanding scriptural example of such a cult — and we known that it exerted a strong influence on Abhinavagupta's exegesis — is the Krama, the cult of Kālī which is taught in the *Devīpañcaśataka (/Kālīkulapañcaśataka),* the *Kramasadbhāva (/ Kālīkulakrama-sadbhāva)* and other such āgamas. [186] There are also the related and equally aniconic cults of the esoteric goddesses Prajñākālī, Kuṇḍaleśvarī and Saptakoṭīśvarī taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala.* [187] Abhinavagupta has elevated the cult of the *Parātriṃśikā* on to the same level by eliminating that text's brief but unambiguous refe-rence to concrete visualization; and he has done what he could in this direction for the cult of the *Mālinīvijayottara.*

9.10.4. However not all Trika ritual was required by Abhinavagupta to transcend the common form of Tantric worship. For in his longer commentary on the *Parātriṃśikā* he says that those who desire to realize the Trika but are unable to establish themselves in such a subtle practice

> ... should resort to the ritual taught in the *Siddhātantra (/ Siddhayogeś-varīmata)* or some other [more exoteric āgama of the Trika] which describes the deities' visualizations and other such [conventional,] contracted me-thods. [188]

Since it is clear that he refers here to worship practised by liberationists it follows that he recognizes or rather advocates three levels of ritual practice within the stream of the Trika with which he is concerned : (i) that of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata,* whose Tantric rites are parallel to those of such 'lower' systems as the cults of

---

(186) The present author is preparing critical editions of these unpublished works.

(187) See JayadYāmT 2, *paṭala* 22 *(prajñākālīvidhānam),* folios 100r 9-102v 3; ibid. 3, *kuṇḍaleśvarīvidhipaṭalaḥ,* folios 107v 1-118v 5; ibid. 4, *prayogamañjarīkuhakādividhipaṭalasap-takoṭīśvarīprakaraṇam,* folios 178v 5-179v 5. I have not been able to decode the *mantra* of Prajñākālī. [That of] Kuṇḍaleśvarī is the syllable *hskhphrem;* ant [that of] Saptakoṭīśvarī is the seven syllabled *mantra kaḥ saḥ caṇḍini saḥ kaḥ.* The *mantras* are taught in code ('raised') at JayadYāmT 3, folio 108r2-5 and ibid, 4, folio 178v6-7. For Saptakoṭīśvarī in the Krama (/Uttarāmnāya) see UttCaru folio 7r 1-3 and MahārthMP 187[2]. She is included among the goddess-*mantras* that receive oblations in the fire-sacrifice of the Kashmirian AgnikPaddh; see folio 75r 1-10, where she does have a visualization text but one in which she is contemplated without specific form, an *avyaktaṃ dhyānam: ekāṭaṅkāṅkamudrā kavalananiratā saptamuṇḍāsanasthā prodbhūtādhāracakrāt pralayaśikhiśikhā saptadhā prasphu-rantī / nād(c)ādyantāntarāle dhvaninidhanamahāvyomavāmeśvarī yā sā devī ghoracaṇḍā paharatu duritaṃ saptakoṭīśvarī naḥ //.*

(188) PTViv 278[10-13] (265[18]-266[4]): *(āruruksur etāvattrikārthābhilāsukaś ca katham ārohatu iti cet kasyāyam arthibhāvaḥ / mā tarhy āruksat /) siddhātantrādividhim eva tadāśayenaiva nirūpitataddhyānādisaṃkocam ālambatām /.*

Svacchandabhairava, Netranātha and the Saiddhāntika Sadāśiva, in which the deity of regular and incidental ritual is worshipped with a common, all-purpose icon; (ii) that of the *Mālinīvijayottara*, in which this pattern is broken, most but not all visualization being referred to the practice of the non-liberationists; and finally (iii) that of the *Parātriṃśikā*, in which the worship of the liberationist is fully aniconic, resting entirely on the *mantra* and subjective contemplation.

10. THEORY AND PRACTICE

10.0. It is this last system, known variously as the Anuttara, Ekavīra or Parākrama, which appears to have been the most enduring and influential. Madhurāja, south Indian ascetic from the great Śaiva centre of Madurai and pupil of Abhinavagupta,[189] speaks of himself as having attained enlightenment (literally 'having mastered the universe') by its power,[190] and is careful to distinguish it from the Trika when praising his master as the highest authority on all branches of the Śaiva revelation.[191] His pupil Varadarāja/Kṛṣṇadāsa speaks of Madhurāja in similar terms as 'having attained sudden penetration into the totality of the thirty-six *tattvas* through the Parākrama'.[192] He was himself, perhaps, the author of the *Parātriṃśikātātparyadīpikā*, composed in the southern temple-city of Cidambaram,[193] which expounds in verse Abhinavagupta's *laghuvṛtti* on the *Parātriṃśikā*, the root text of this tradition.[194] Other works from south India in this system are the *Parāpañcāsikā* alias *Anuttaraprakāśapañcāsikā* of Ādyanātha[195] and the *Parākrama*, a text

_____

(189) See GuruP 41 *(mādhurah)*; 40, 43, 44, 46 and colophon *(madhurājaḥ)*; 19, 20 *(namo 'bhinavaguptagurūttamāya)*; 32 *(na madgurvadhikaḥ kaścid)*; 33 *(maddaiśikaḥ)*.

(190) GuruP 40: *parākramākrāntaviśvadikcakre ... madhurāje mayi ...*

(191) GuruP18: *siddhāntavāmabhairavayāmalakaulatrikaikaviravidām / abhinavaguptaḥ śrīmān ācāryapade sthito jayati //*, 'The glorious Abhinavagupta reigns victorious, for he is the ultimate human authority *(ācāryaḥ)* for all who know the Siddhānta, the Vāma, the Bhairava, the Yāmala, the Kaula, the Trika or the Ekavīra.' The use of the term Ekavīra for this system is also seen in Kṣemarāja's gloss on NeT 13. 39c *(yāmale caikavīre ca): ekavīra iti parātriśikāmatatrimśikādau* (NeTU 1 [13] 274[7-8]).

(192) SivSūVārt 212-214b: *akhaṇḍasaṃvitsāmrājyayauvarājyādhikāriṇām / parākramahaṭhākrāntaṣaṭtriṃśatattvasaṃpadām // madhurājakumārāṇāṃ mahāhantādhirohiṇām / paścimena tadālokadhvastapaścimajanmanā // mayā varadarājena...*

(193) See above p. 00, nn. 9 and 10.

(194) The PTTātD is anonymous in its edition; but there are MSS of a *Parātriṃśikā-laghuvṛttivimarśinī* by Kṛṣṇadāsa in Kerala which may well be the same work (Trivandrum Univ. MSS Library Cat. 537 - 8[MSS 5854F and C.2108D]).

(195) See PPañcās 50cd: *parākramaparo bhuṅkte svabhāvam aśivāpaham /.* Note also the reference to *hṛdayam (= sauḥ)* as the essence of Mātṛkā *(a - kṣa)* at 41.

of unknown authorship surviving in quotations in Amṛtānandanātha's commentary on the *Yoginīhṛdaya*.[196] We have already seen what is perhaps the most striking evidence of the prevalence of this cult among the Śaivas of south India during the second millenium : its incorporation into the system of goddess-worship which centres on Lalitā and is recorded in the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*. Extremely learned practical commentaries on this text survive to testify to its enduring status : the *Nityotsava* composed in AD 1745 by Umānandanātha (Jagannāthapaṇḍita), a Maharashtrian devotee of Lalitā who was honoured, he tells us, by the Bhosle of Cola, that is, by the ruler at the Marātha court of Tanjore;[197] and the *Saubhāgyodaya* composed in AD 1831 by Aparājitānandanātha (Rāmeśvara), another Maharashtrian.[198] A commentary, now lost, was also composed by the great Bhāsurānandanātha (Bhāskararāya Makhin) of Banaras, who initiated Umānandanātha on the banks of the Kāverī during a visit to the south.[199] A. Mahadeva Sastri, the editor of these two

_____

(196) YogHṛD 276[2-3] (see above, p. 00, n. 0); 286[3-7]; 294[8-13].

(197) See Nityots 224[7-12]: *śrutapeṭavopanāmnā colādhipabhosalendumānyena / nāṭakakāvyādikṛtā mahitamahārāṣṭrajātihīreṇa // trayyantatattvaśīlanadalitajaga-*chatra*jālamohena / bhāratyupākhyabhāskaramakhideśikalabdhadaikṣanāmnāyam // āmnāyatantrajālālokapareṇāryasampradāyajuṣā lalitāpadābjarolambena jagannāthapaṇḍitena / kalyabdeṣu rasārṇavakarivedamiteṣu iha vyatīteṣu / navyaḥ krodhanaśaradi nyabandhi nityotsavaḥ śivaprītyai /*, 'I the most learned Jagannātha, surnamed Śrutapeṭava, honoured by the Bhosle of Cola, author of dramas and *kāvyas*, bringer of glory to the line of the caste of the Maharashtrian [Deśastha brahmins], who by the study of the Upaniṣads have broken through the ignorance [which is the basis of] the world *...*, who received my initiation-name [Umānandanātha] from the teacher Bhāskara Makhin titled -bhāratī, who am devoted to the study of the Vedas and the Tantras, a recipient of the venerable tradition, a bee [drawn] to the lotuses which are the feet of the goddess Lalitā, have composed [this] new *Nityotsava* for the pleasure of Śiva in the autumn of the fifty-ninth year of the Jovian cycle, 4846 years of the Kali age having passed.' The editor (ParaśurKS Pt. 1, xi) reads this as 4876 (AD 1775) by interpreting -*arṇava*- 'oceans' as 7 rather than as 4. But this is an error, as can be seen from the same author's dating of his HṛdA (91[18-19]): *kalyabdeṣu gateṣu agni[3]-śruti[4]-nāgā[8]-bdhi-[4]saṃkhyayā*, 'Kali Era 4843 [AD 1742].' See also HṛdA viii on the dates of his various works.

(198) ParaśurKSSaubhBhāsk 336[15]-337[3] gives the author's initiation name (Aparājitānandanātha) and the date of composition *(agnibāṇādribhūsaṅkhye śāke tapasi gispateḥ / vāsare śuklapakṣasya dina ādye niśāmukhe) //*, 'At the beginning of the night on Thursday, the first day of the bright fortnight of the month Phālguna, Śaka 1753'. His secular name is given in the colophons. That he too was a Maharashtrian brahmin is evident from the fact that he gives Marāṭhī glosses on certain obscure terms (see, e.g., 114[2, 3, 4,5]), refers to differences in the rites of passage observed by Maharashtrians, Drāviḍas and Āndhras (11[8,10]), and quotes the *Hiraṇyakeśigṛhyasūtra* and a commentary thereon (92[14]; 18[1]). This *Gṛhyasūtra* is that of the Koṅkaṇastha (Citpāvana) brahmins of Mahārāṣṭra (see Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, Vol. XVII, Pt 1 [Poona], Bombay, 1885).

(199) The existence of this commentary, called -*ratnāloka*, is testified by Umānandanātha / Jagannātha in his *Bhaktivilāsakāvya*; see Pandey 1963, 588-589. It is also referred to by Umānandanātha at Nityots 2[14] : *tat sarvaṃ śrīguruprokte ratnāloke 'dhigamyatām*. For the initiation of Umānandanātha see Nityots 1[7-8]. Bhāskararāya too was Maharashtrian, as can be seen from the names of his paternal grandfather and great-grandfather: Tukadeva and Ekanātha; see Pandey 1963, 585.

texts, refers to the commentary of yet another Maharashtrian, Lakṣmaṇa Rānaḍe, composed in AD 1883. Finally, there is the *Mahātripurasundarīvarivasyā* compiled from these earlier works by the late Karapātrasvāmī and edited by his pupil Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī (AD 1962).

10.1. This south Indian tradition is fully aware of its debt to Abhinavagupta and the other Kashmirian authorities of the ninth and tenth centuries. Their works were held in the highest esteem and continued to provide the theoretical basis of an āgamic, non-Upanishadic non-dualism among the devotees of the Goddess at least into the nineteenth century.[200] Since their system incorporates the Anuttara cult and considers Parā to be the inner nature of Lalitā herself, we might assume that they would have inherited Abhinavagupta's position on this cult, namely that the worship of Parā should be aniconic. But it has not. It is precisely the south Indian sources on the Anuttara cult that have provided our best evidence for Parā's visualization. The *Parātriṃśikātātparyadīpikā* itself contains this icon, though in general it is a faithful exposition of Abhinavagupta's shorter commentary on the seminal scripture of this tradition. It might appear, then, that this was one matter on which the prescription of the Kashmirian tradition was not considered binding. However it would be more accurate to say that Abhinavagupta's icon-less Anuttara cult never was and never could be a reality in action. His exegesis of the *Parātriṃśikā* is an exercise in translating ritual into pure thought, and ultimately into a metaphorical description of an absolute reality that cannot descend without distortion even into the sequence of ratiocination. The purpose of such writing was no doubt to prescribe an attitude of transcendence to be cultivated while performing rituals, an attitude which could justify ritual activity for Śaivas who were being asked to accept a non-dualistic metaphysics which would seem to make it redundant.[201] It could also justify the existence of Śaivas who performed no rituals in the true sense : their purely conceptual or yogic religion could thus be shown to be a kind of ritual after all, and therefore

---

(200) The *Tripurārahasyajñānakhaṇḍatātparyadīpikā* is an outstanding example of this. Composed in AD 1832 by Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa, an inhabitant of Mahāpuṣkara, one of the five grāmas of Madurai (TripRahTātDip 452³⁻¹²), it follows the [Kashmirian] Śivādvaita of the text (itself composed in Tamilnadu), supports it with quotations from the works of Vasugupta, Somānanda, Utpaladeva, Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja, and has a keen sense of the opposition between its own āgamic doctrine and that of the Aupaniṣadas (the Advaitavedānta of the Śaṅkarācāryas).

(201) See Sanderson 1990.

---

to be less unorthodox than it might otherwise seem. What it did not do was to change the ritual itself for those who performed it. Whatever they might think while performing it, or whatever they might aspire to through assimilating the works of Abhinavagupta and the other advanced literature of the tradition, they continued to visualize Parā as they would any other Tantric deity.

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE NOTES

BN = Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Bod. = Bodleian Library, Oxford. GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series. KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. MP = *Mantrapāda*. NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu. PIFI = Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie. STK 7 = Photographically reproduced by Lokesh Chandra in *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir*, Volume 7 (Śatapiṭaka Series No. 333), New Delhi, 1984. TT = *Tantrik Texts*.

Primary Sources

AgnikPaddh	*Agnikāryapaddhati*. BN, MS Sanscrit 166A.
AgnikPaddh²	*Agnikāryapaddhati*. Bod., MS Chandra Shum Shere f. *110*.
AgnP	*Agnipurāṇa*. Ed. Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series 174. Varanasi. 1966.
AmbSt	*Ambāstava*. See PañcSt.
AhirbSam	*Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā*. Ed. Pandit M.D. Ramanujacharya, rev. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya. Adyar Library Series. Volume 4.2 Parts. Madras. 1966 (2nd ed.).
ĀgRah	*Āgamarahasya* [*uttarārdha*] by Sarayūprasād Dviveda. Ed. Gaṅgādhar Dviveda. Rājasthāna Purātana Granthamālā 110. Jodhpur. 1969.
ĪśānŚGDPaddh	*Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* [*Siddhāntasāra*]. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77, 83. Trivandrum. 1920-25.
ĪśvPratVim	*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* by Abhinavagupta. Ed. Mukund Ram (Vol. 1) and Madhusudan Kaul (Vol. 2). KSTS 22, 33. Bombay. 1918, 1921.
ĪśvPratVivVim	*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī* by Abhinavagupta. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 60, 72, 75. Bombay. 1938-43.
UttCaru	*Uttaracaruvidhāna*. NAK MS 1/1559.
UttĀmnPavĀrohV	*Uttarāmnāyapavitrārohaṇavidhi*. NAK MAS 1/70.
KarmK	*Karmakāṇḍa* Volume 4. Ed. Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid [= Keshav Bhat Zutish]. Bombay. 1936. [STK 7].
KaśmDTīrthSam	*Kaśmīradeśatīrthasaṃgraha* (Skt.) by Pt. Sāhib Rām. Bod., MS Stein. or. d. 2.
KālīkulaKA	*Kālīkulakramārcana* by Vimalaprabodha. NAK MS 5 / 5188.
KaśmKarmKPaddh	[*Kāśmīrikakarmakāṇḍapaddhati*]. Bod., MS Sansk. d. 335 ('Awaiting description'). [Folios 295r13-296r19: *Ekāntavāsinīdevatāyāgaḥ*].
KubjM	*Kubjikāmatatantra: Kulālikāmnāya Version*. Ed. T. Goudriaan and J.A. Schoterman. Leiden. 1988.
KulRatnU	*Kularatnoddyota*. Bod., MS Chandra Shum Shere c. 348.

KulārṇT — *Kulāmavatantra*. Ed. Tārānātha Vidyāratna. TT 5. London. 1917.

KaulāvN — *Kaulāvalīnirṇaya* by Jñānānandagiri. Ed. A. Avalon. TT 14. Calcutta. Saṃvat 1985 [AD 1928/9].

GuhyKāPūV — *Guhyakālīpūjāvidhi*. NAK MS 1 / 1696 / 239.

GuruP — *Gurunāthaparāmarśa* by Madhurāja. Ed. P.N. Pushp. KSTS 85. Srinagar. 1960.

JayadYāmT — *Jayadrathayāmalatantra*. NAK MS 5/4650 (ṣaṭkas 1 and 2); NAK MS 5 / 1976 (ṣaṭka 3); NAK MS 1 / 1468 (ṣaṭka 4).

JayadYāmMUddh — *Jayadrathayāmalamantroddhāraṭippanī* (anonymous). NAK MS 1 /1514.

JñānārṇT — *Jñānārṇavatantra*. Ed. Gaṇeśa Śāstrī Gokhale. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Texts Series 69. Pune. 1952 (2nd ed.).

TanSadbh — *Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK MS 1 / 363.

TSāra — *Tantrasāra* by Abhinavagupta. Ed. Mukund Ram Sastri. KSTS 17. Bombay. 1918.

TĀ, -V — *Tantrāloka* by Abhinavagupta, with the commentary (-viveka) of Jayaratha. Ed. Mukund Ram Sastri. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay - Srinagar. 1918-38.

TantrColl — *Tantric Collectanea*. Bod., MS Chandra Shum Shere e. 264.

TantrDigUnkN — *A Tantric Digest of Unknown Name*. Asiatic Society of Bengal. MS 11354.

TridaśadāmPraty-VNT — *Tridaśadāmarapratyaṅgirāviṣayakanānātantra*. NAK MS 3 / 30.

TripRahTātD — *Tripurārahasya (Jñānakhaṇḍa)*, with the commentary (-tātparyadīpikā) by Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa. Ed. Gopinath Kaviraj. Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā 15. Varanasi. 1965.

DevīdvyŚ — *Devīdvyardhaśatikā*. NAK MS 1 / 242.

DevīdhyRatnM — *Devīdhyānaratnamālāstutiḥ* [Durgāpūjāyām]. In *Gaṇeśa-Durgāstotrāvalī*. Ed. Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid [= Keshav Bhat Zutish], Bombay, 1935, pp. 63-79 [15].

DevīpañcŚ — *Devīpañcaśataka*. NAK MS 1 / 252 folios 1 - 31 [= *Kālīkula-pañcaśataka*]. The MS is wrongly catalogued as *Kālīkākula-kramārcana*.

Devīrah — *Devīrahasya with Pariśiṣṭas*. Ed. Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. KSTS. Srinagar. 1941. Reprinted Delhi: Butala. Publications. 1985.

DhKoś 3, III — *Dharmakośa. Saṃskārakāṇḍa*. Volume III, Part III. Ed. Laxmanshastri Joshi. Satara. 1981.

Nityāṣoḍ, - ARĀ — *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, with the commentaries of Śivānanda (-ṛjuvimarśinī) and Vidyānanda (-artharatnāvalī). Ed. V.V. Dvivedi. Yogatantragranthamālā 1. Varanasi: Sanskrit University. 1968.

NityāhnTil — [Kubjikā-]*Nityāhnikatilaka* by Muktaka. NAK MS 3 / 384.

Nityots — *Nityotsava* by Jagannāthapaṇḍita (Umānandanātha) [, commentary on the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*]. GOS 23 [Published as *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra* Part 2]. Baroda. 1923.

NeT, -U — *Netratantra*, with the commentary (-uddyota) of Kṣemarāja. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 46, 61. Bombay. 1926, 1939.

PañcSt — *Pañcastavī [Laghustava, Carcāstava, Ghaṭastava, Ambāstava, Sakalajananīstava]*. Ed. Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnātha Pāṇḍuraṅga Paraba. Kāvyamālā Pt. III. Bombay. 1887.

ParamSāra — *Paramārthasāra* by Abhinavagupta, with the commentary (vivṛti) of Yogarāja. Ed. J.C. Chatterji. KSTS 7. Srinagar. 1916.

ParaśurKS, -SaubhBh — *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*, with the commentary (-saubhāgya-bhāskara) of Rāmeśvara (Aparājitānandanātha). Ed. A. Mahadeva Sastri. GOS 22. Baroda. 1923.

PT, -LaghVṛ — *Parātriṃśikā*, with the [shorter] commentary -laghuvṛtti, also called *Anuttaravimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta. Ed. Jagaddhara Zadoo. KSTS 68. Srinagar. 1947.

PT, -Viv — Raniero Gnoli, *Il Commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā (Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇam)*. *Traduzione e Testo*. Serie Orientale Roma LVIII. Roma: IIMEO. 1985. References are to this edition, followed in parentheses by references to the edition of Mukund Ram Sastri (KSTS 18. Bombay. 1918).

PTTātD — *Parātriśikātātparyadīpikā* (anonymous commentary on the *Parātriṃśikālaghuvṛtti* of Abhinavagupta). Ed. Jagaddhara Zadoo Shastri KSTS 74. Srinagar. 1947.

PPañcāś — *Parāpañcāśikā [/ Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā]* by Ādyanātha. Ed. V.V. Dvivedi as an appendix in YogHṛD (395-400).

PiṅgM — *Piṅgalāmata*. NAK MS 3 / 376.

PicM-BY — *Picumata-Brahmayāmala*. NAK MS 3 / 370.

PuraścArṇ — *Puraścaryārṇava* by King Pratāpasiṃhadeva Shah of Nepal [ruled AD 1775 - 1777]. Ed. Muralidhar Jha. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 10. Delhi: Chowkhamba. 1980. Reprint.

PrapañcS, -V, -PKD — *Prapañcasāratantra* by Śaṅkarācārya, with commentary (-vṛtti) by Padmapādācārya, and subcommentary (-prayoga-kramadīpikā) by an unknown author. Ed. Aṭalānanda Sarasvatī. TT 19. Calcutta. 1935. Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1981.

BodhPañc — *Bodhapañcadaśikā* by Abhinavagupta, with the commentary (-vivaraṇa) of Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. Ed. Jagaddhara Zadoo Shastri. KSTS 76. Srinagar. 1947.

BrahmāP — *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*. Veṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press. Bombay. Saṃvat 1992 [AD 1935/6].

BhairAnukSt — *Bhairavānukaraṇastotra* by Kṣemarāja. Ed. Raneiro Gnoli. 'Miscellanea Indica', *East and West*, New Series, Volume 9, No. 3, September 1958, 223-226.

MahātripV — *Mahātripurasundarīvarivasyā* [compiled] by Karapātra Svāmī. Ed. Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī. Calcutta. 1962.

MahārthM, -P — *Mahārthamañjarī* by Maheśvarānanda, with auto-commentary (-parimala). Ed. V.V. Dvivedi. Varanasi: Sanskrit University. 1972.

MālVijUT — *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 37. Srinagar. 1922.

Mṛg — *Mṛgendrāgama [Kriyāpāda (KP) and Caryāpāda (CP)]*, with the commentary (-vṛtti) of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha. Ed. N.R. Bhatt. PIFI 23. Pondichéry. 1962.

YogHṛ, -D — *Yoginīhṛdaya*, with the commentary (-dīpikā) of Amṛtānandanātha. Ed. V.V. Dvivedi. Delhi. 1988.

RahPañc — *Rahasyapañcadaśikā*, attributed to Abhinavagupta. Ed. K.C. Pandey (1963: 954-56).

LaghSt   *Laghustava*. See PañcSt.

Lalitop   *Lalitopākhyāna*. Part of BrahmāP *(uttarabhāga, upasamhā-rapāda, adhyāyas* 5-44 [pp. 254b-339b]).

VijñBh, -V   *Vijñānabhairavatantra*, with the commentary *(-uddyota)* of Kṣemarāja surviving on verses 1 to 23, and that *(-vivṛti)* of Śivopādhyāya on the rest. Ed. Mukund Ram Sastri. KSTS 8. Bombay. 1918.

VijñBh, -D   *Vijñānabhairavatantra*, with the commentary *(-dīpikā* [also called *Vijñānakaumudī*]) of Bhaṭṭa (/ Bhaṭṭāraka) Ānanda. Ed. Mukund Ram Sastri. KSTS 9 [bound with VijñBh, -V]. Bombay. 1918.

VivV   *Vivāhavidhi*. Ed. Paṇḍita Nātharāma Śāstrin. Srinagar. Vikrama Samvat 1996 [= AD 1939/40]. [STK 7].

ViṣṇDhUP   *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa, khaṇḍa* 3. Ed. Priyabala Shah. GOS 130. Baroda. 1958.

VedKalpD   *Vedakalpadruma. [Kāśmīrīyatraivarṇyopayogī laugākṣimu-niprakḷptaḥ]*. Ed. Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid [= Keshav Bhat Zutish]. Bombay. Saptarṣi Samvat 4997 [=AD 1921 / 22]. [STK 7].

ŚambhNirṇ   *Śambhunirṇaya*, with the commentary *(-dīpikā)* of Śivānanda [author of *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava-ṛjuvimarśinī*]. Madras Govt. Oriental Manuscript Library MS 14695 (R No. 3203 c,d)

ŚārTil, -PĀ   *Śāradātilaka* by Lakṣmaṇadeśika, with commentary *(-padārthādarśa)* by Rāghavabhaṭṭa. Ed. A. Avalon. TT 17. Calcutta. 1933.

ŚivSūVārt   *Śivasūtravārtika* by Varadarāja [alias Kṛṣṇadāsa]. KSTS 43. Srinagar. 1925.

ŚivSūVim   *Śivasūtravimarśinī* by Kṣemarāja. Ed. J.C. Chatterji. KSTS 1. Srinagar. 1911.

ŚVidyārṇT   *Śrīvidyārṇavatantra [Pt. 1]* by Vidyāraṇyayati. Ed. Bhadra-śīla Śarma. Prayāg: Kalyāṇ Mandir. Samvat 2023 [AD 1977].

SaṭsāhṬipp   *Saṭsāhasraṭippaṇa* (anonymous) [a commentary on the *Kulālikāmnāya* version of the *Kubjikāmata*]. NAK MS 1/30 [Catalogued as *Kulālikāmnāya*].

SomŚPaddh 3   *Somaśambhupaddhati* [*Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* by So-maśambhu] Pt. 3. Ed., transl., annot. Hélène Brunner-La-chaux. PIFI No. 25 III. Pondichéry. 1977.

SaundLah   *Saundaryalaharī* of Śaṅkarācārya. Ed. W. Norman Brown. Harvard Oriental Series 43. Cambridge. 1958.

SaundLahL   *Saundaryalaharī* of Śaṅkarācārya, with the commentaries of Kaivalyāśrama *(-saubhāgyavardhanī)*, Lakṣmīdhara *(-lakṣmīdharī* [L]) and Kāmeśvarasūri *(-aruṇāmodinī)*. Ed. & transl. R. Anantakṛṣṇa Śāstrī and Śrī Karrā Rāmamūrthy Gāru. Madras: Ganesh & Co. 1957.

SvT, -U   *Svacchandatantra*, with the commentary *(-uddyota)* of Kṣemarāja. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay. 1921-35.

HṛdA   *Hṛdayāmṛta* by Jagannāthapaṇḍita [author of Nityots] Ed. H.V. Nagaraja Rao. Oriental Research Institute Series 134. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute. 1980.

Secondary sources

Chhabra, B.C.
1966   "Svachchhanda Bhairavī Bronze Image from Kangra," *Journal of Indian History*, XLII, 1, pp. 145-148.

CNRS.
1986   *Mantras et Diagrammes Rituels dans l'Hindouisme* [Table Ronde. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Équipe n⁰ 249 "L'hindouisme: texte, doctrines, pratiques."]. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.

Gnoli, Raniero,
1972.   *Luce della Sacre Scritture (Tantrāloka) di Abhinavagupta (traduzione)*. Torino : Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese.

Goudriaan, T. and Schoterman, J.A.
1988.   *The Kubjikāmata: Kulālikāmnāya Version*. Leiden etc.: Brill.

Grierson, Sir G.A. [assisted by Mukundarāma Śāstrī]
1915, 32.   *A Dictionary of the Kāshmīrī Language*. Calcutta: Asiatic Soc. of Bengal. 2 Parts.

Kulke, Hermann.
1970.   *Cidambaramāhātmya. Eine Untersuchungen der religions-geschichtlichen und historischen Hintergründe für die Ents-tehlung einer süd-indischen Templestadt*. Wiesbaden: Har-rassowitz.

Macdonald, A.W. and Vergati Stahl, Anne.
1979.   *Newar Art; Nepalese Art during the Malla Period*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

de Mallmann, Marie-Thérèse.
1963   *Les Enseignements Iconographiques de l'Agnipurāṇa*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Mitchell, G., Lampert C., and Holland T.
1982.   *In the Image of Man. Hayward Gallery, London 25 March-13 June 1982*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Padoux, André
1963   *Recherches sur la Symbolique et l'Énergie de la Parole dans certain Textes Tantriques*. Paris: Boccard.

Pal, Pratapaditya.
1975   *Bronzes of Kashmir*. Graz: Akademische Druck · u. Verlagsanstalt.

Pandey, Kanti Candra.
1963.   *Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study*. 2nd ed. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.

Rawson, Philip.
1973.   *Tantra*. London: Thames and Hudson.

1978.   *The Art of Tantra*. London.

Sanderson, Alexis.
1986.   'Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir' in CNRS 1986, 169-214.

1988.   'Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions' in Stewart Sutherland et al. eds., *The World's Religions*, London: Routledge, 660-704.

1990.

Schoterman, J A.
1982.

Schrader, F. Otto.
1916.

Sharma, B.N.
1971.

Stein, M.A.
1900.

'Meaning in Tantric Ritual' in Anne-Marie Blondeau and Kristofer Schipper eds., *Essais sur le Rituel III. [Colloque du Centenaire de la section des Sciences Religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études].* Louvain-Paris: Peeters. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Vol. XCII. (Forthcoming).

The Saṭsāhasra Saṃhitā, Chapters 1-5. Edited, translated and annotated. Leiden: Brill.

Introduction to the Pañcarātra and the Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā. Madras: Adyar Library.

"Consort of Sadāśiva," *Oriental Art,* XVII, 4, pp. 354-356.

Kalhaṇa's Rājatarangiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir. Translated with an introduction, commentary & appendices. 2 Volumes. London.

IMAGE MENTALE, MÉDITATION ET CULTE DANS LA ŚRĪVIDYĀ

(Quelques exemples tirés du Yoginīhṛdaya)*

PAR

ANDRÉ PADOUX

La tradition de la Śrīvidyā, où se pratique le culte des Yoginī, se rattache par là à une ancienne tradition śivaïte, née dans ce qu'on nomme parfois la « voie des mantras » *(mantramarga)*, où les divers plans du cosmos ont pour régents des divinités féminines, les Yoginī. Elle apparaît comme une des branches de l'ensemble du Kula, dont elle aurait formé — au moins à ses débuts — la « transmission méridionale » *(dakṣiṇāmnāya)*[1]. La divinité principale y est Tripurasundarī, « La Belle des Trois mondes », parfois nommée Kāmeśvarī (elle est alors associée à Kāmeśvara, dieu de l'amour ou plutôt de la jouissance érotique). Son culte, ses rites, avec les spéculations qui les entourent, ont, de fait, une tonalité plutôt érotique, ou en tout cas aimable et ils sont en cela assez différents des cultes de Kālī ou d'autres divinités terribles du tantrisme.

Mais ce qui caractérise surtout la Śrīvidyā, c'est que la Déesse y a pour *mūlamantra* la *śrīvidyā*[2] et qu'elle est adorée au moyen d'un diagramme, le *śrīcakra*, qui est à la fois sa forme diagrammatique et l'aire sur laquelle se fait son culte : Tripurasundarī siège au milieu

---

(*) Je développe ici un peu une brève intervention faite au cours de la discussion qui avait suivi l'exposé de François Chenet, qu'on lira plus loin.

(1) Sur l'évolution probable des sectes ou traditions śivaïtes au cours des âges, on se reportera à l'étude d'Alexis Sanderson, « Śaivism and the Tantric Tradition », parue dans Sutherland *et al.,* eds. *The World's Religions* (London : Routledge, 1988, pp. 660-704).

(2) Mantra formé de trois groupes de *bīja* ayant ensemble le plus souvent quinze ou seize syllabes.

L'IMAGE DIVINE

CULTE ET MÉDITATION
DANS L'HINDOUISME

Études rassemblées par

André Padoux

Directeur de recherche au CNRS